The Communist

20c NOVEMBER 1942

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

EARL BROWDER • V. J. JEROME • HANS BERGER

•

THE SECOND FRONT AND THE WINTER OF 1942-43

EUGENE DENNIS

•

JOHN L. LEWIS AND THE MINERS' CONVENTION

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

TRENDS IN THE A.F. OF L. CONVENTION

ROSE WORTIS

•

NATIONAL UNITY IN CANADA

TIM BUCK

•

EARL BROWDER'S "VICTORY—AND AFTER"

Reviewed by A. LANDY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ready Now—

The One-Volume Edition of

LENINISM

By Joseph Stalin

This great classic of Marxist-Leninist theory, containing close to 500 pages, will bring together between the covers of a single volume selections from the major works of Joseph Stalin. In contrast to the previous two-volume edition, which covered Stalin's writings between 1924 and 1932, the new One-Volume Edition of **Leninism** embraces all of his most important writings, speeches, reports and lectures during the fifteen-year period 1924-1939.

The new volume will include such valuable material as Stalin's reports at the 17th and 18th Congresses of the Bolshevik Party, his renowned speeches on the Soviet Constitution and on Stakhanovism, his address to the graduates of the Red Army School, his celebrated article on dialectical and historical materialism, speeches on collectivization of agriculture, etc., not published in the original two-volume edition, which is now out of print. **$2.00**

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

The most authoritative study of the formation, development, struggles and achievements of the Bolshevik Party from its earliest origins up to the eve of the present world war of liberation. An indispensable guide in the study of Leninism. **$.75**

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXI, No. 10 NOVEMBER, 1942

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Twenty-five Years of Soviet Power	*Earl Browder*	867
The Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Soviet Power	*V. J. Jerome*	869
Our Nation Discovers the Soviet Union	*Hans Berger*	886
The Second Front and the Winter of 1942-43	*Eugene Dennis*	894
National Unity for Total War	*Tim Buck*	903
The Miners' Convention	*William Z. Foster*	911
Trends in the A. F. of L.	*Rose Wortis*	922
Earl Browder Charts the Course to Victory	*A. Landy*	937
Historic Documents		956

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New and Forthcoming Pamphlets

The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.:
War Allies and Friends,
By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER . . . . . $.01

Women in the War,
By ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN 05

Public Speaking: The Speaker's Guide Book
By PETER V. CACCHIONE 05

Speed the Second Front,
By EARL BROWDER, WILLIAM Z. FOSTER,
ISRAEL AMTER and MAX WEISS 01

The United States and Mexico:
Two Nations—One Ideal,
By VICENTE LOMBARDO TOLEDANO . . .05

The Negro's Stake in Victory,
By PETTIS PERRY 05

The Crisis in India,
By JAMES S. ALLEN 05

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway),
New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

BY EARL BROWDER

THIS twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power is witness to the most profound change of the attitude of the people of the United States as a whole toward the U.S.S.R. and its great leaders. For the first time there is almost universal understanding of the Soviet Union as a stage in the rise of mankind to higher civilization. There is a high and rising evaluation of the Soviet Union as the most powerful friend and ally of the United States. And there is love for and gratitude toward the Soviet Union as the power which has so far saved this country and world democracy from destruction by the Axis aggressors.

Nothing in modern history has so profoundly stirred the American masses as the heroic defense of Stalingrad. Americans know their own fate is being decided in that battle. Americans are ashamed that the full force of our own country has not yet been thrown into the scale through the opening of the Western Front in Europe. For the great mass of Americans now understand full well that they can emerge from this war a free people only if they fight this war as a part of the United Nations, side by side with the Soviet Union, in full partnership, unitedly sharing its costs and burdens in full as they will jointly share the fruits of victory.

There are still some reactionary cliques in America which cling to their old dreams of helping to destroy the Soviet Union and making partnership with Hitler in dividing up the world. They are not large in numbers, but they are powerful. They are the most bitter opponents of the Second Front and the advocates of a negotiated "peace" with Hitler. They still dominate much of the American newspaper world. They represent some of the most powerful industrial monopolists in America. Their influence holds back the immense potential power of the United States, and prevents it from being thrown into full action to smash Hitlerism now. But these native American fascists are rapidly losing their power over the nation, and have already lost their control over the minds of the people.

The American people and government are committed to alliance with the Soviet Union for this war and for the post-war period. American patriots will not tolerate in public life any expression that runs counter to this will of the people. This is being demonstrated more and more every day in a thousand different ways. The Soviet-American alliance has been confirmed in the hearts and minds of the Ameri-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can masses. On November 7 it will be the entire nation which celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the rise of the Soviet Union, including the official leadership of the United States as well as the masses of the people.

This does not mean that the United States has turned or is turning to socialism. Such an interpretation would be radically false. There is no intimation in the United States of a mass abandonment of its capitalist system of economy and society. There is the general belief that if the United States rises to its tasks in this war, and fulfills its responsibilities in the crushing of Hitlerism, that it will go into the post-war period as a capitalist nation.

But this also is no contradiction to a further fact, that the American people are beginning to understand that the socialist society of the Soviet Union is the source of its unparalleled achievements in the war which restored for the United Nations the perspective of victory. Socialism, even though not generally accepted for the United States, is no longer looked upon as something alien and hostile to the American way of life, which was the view which had long prevailed over the minds of the great majority of Americans.

On the twenty-fifth birthday of the Soviet Union the American working class and people are more and more raising their voices to demand an immediate offensive on the Western Front against Hitlerism. Wendell Willkie expresses, on this issue, the sentiment of the American masses, who believe that President Roosevelt is fully committed to the same demand and are ready to strengthen his hand by all means, so that all restraining and hesitating influences can finally be brushed aside.

Americans want to fight. They want to fight in full coordination with the Red Army, which they respect and love. They want to fight now. They will never forgive those groups and individuals responsible for holding them back so long from the fight. Such is in truth the spirit of the great majority of Americans as we come to the historic date of November 7.

For the American people the date November 7 takes its place alongside our own July 4, as part of the same forward movement of the human race. Just as Americans have always affirmed the universal significance of our revolution of 1776 and of George Washington, so now we have come to recognize the universal validity of November 7, the Soviet revolution of 1917 and Joseph Stalin.

In the fires of the common war against Hitlerism, in the blood of the best sons of both countries given to a common cause, in the gathering of the peoples of the world into the United Nations, in the final winning of victory through joint struggle, this American-Soviet friendship and alliance will be so fully sealed that it will be a great fortress for the collective security and progress of all peoples in the post-war world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET POWER

BY V. J. JEROME

TWENTY-FIVE years ago the Soviet State was founded. Today all progressive humanity marks the event in tribute.

Out of the experiences burnt into their consciousness in this global war for the destruction of fascism, the peoples have come increasingly to recognize the meaning of the Soviet Union's existence to their national freedom, to their democratic attainments. The barriers of confusion, prejudice and hostility, built up for years by Soviet-haters, are breaking down under the spring torrents of liberated admiration and widening understanding for the Soviet people and its leaders. Day after day public utterances of leading Americans bespeak the deep-going solidarity of America's millions with our valiant and most powerful and most dependable ally:

"Street by street, house by house, life for life, Russia fights for her existence and for world security against aggression," declares former Ambassador to the Soviet Union Joseph E. Davies. "They are also fighting our fight when they are fighting Hitler. From Thermopylae to Verdun history records no spirit more indomitable, more heroic, than that of the Soviet Union, its leaders, its brave army, its unconquerable people."

"The Catholic Youth Organization is thrilled by the visit of Miss Lyudmila Pavlichenko to Chicago at the invitation of our outstanding mayor," says Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, Director-General of the Catholic Youth Organization. "She represents a great people who are writing history by their heroic defense against a ruthless invader. May God bless them."

"No man can leave Stalin's presence these days without admiration for his devotion to the cause of saving his people from the barbarous thrusts of Hitler's merciless hordes," says Wendell Willkie on his departure from Moscow.

They who in the past have blocked American-Soviet friendship do not conceal their alarm. Wendell Willkie's declarations extolling the Soviet Union and calling for a Second Front have aroused the fury and hatred of the defeatist press. The resentment is not limited to the defeatists. *The New York Times* seems to be disturbed by the fact that "almost every observer sent into Russia," the President's envoy included, "sends back messages which are almost an echo of the Russian call for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

help." And the *Times* offers its analysis:

"We do think they have come into the field of a vast emotion. Out of the depths of the Russian nature there has sprung something of awe-inspiring splendor. We think this is greater than communism. We have a right to hope that it may after this war liberalize and spiritualize communism's hard outlines."*

The *Times* is correct in speaking of awe-inspiring splendor, of the vast emotion that impels the Soviet people to deeds of heroism which are the glory of humanity. But why, we have the right to ask, has the nature of this splendor, its very possibility, been withheld from our nation for twenty-five years—yes, by the very journal that sports the motto "All the news that's fit to print"? And how shall those answer who have systematically sought to conceal the source of this heroic emotion in the Soviet man, woman and child? How shall they answer who have sought to defame and belittle that source?

Out of the depths of the Russian nature? Shades of the Dostoievskian soul and fumes of the confession gases! The years have not passed in such number that we cannot still hear that same camp of psycho-politicos exclaiming that the economic and cultural backwardness of Russia under the tsars expressed the peculiarities of the "Russian soul": Not in the Russian nature rich in the centuries-old heritage of struggle against oppression, not in the nature that brought forth the vanguard Russian proletariat, but in the sloth of Oblomovism* they saw the "soul" of Russia; in the phosphorescence of decay they beheld that soul's splendor—it survived for them among the tsarist emigrés of Paris and Mukden. Since a certain day in late 1917, however, they have not otherwise found the "Russian nature" so palatable; now they revert to it in order to weaken the summons of America's goodwill emissary to common fighting action.

There *is* a "Russian nature" out of which has sprung awe-inspiring splendor. That nature is no mystical abstraction. It inheres in concrete reality—the economic, political and social status of the Soviet people. It is the nature of a people that has transformed its nature. It is the nature of a people that has made the leap from Oblomovism to Stakhanovism. It is the nature of that people of whom Wendell Willkie said: *"Here in Russia you realize the real meaning of the phrase 'This is a people's war.'"* It is the nature that may attain like splendor in all peoples when their inherent greatness is released by great historic aims.

The nature of the Soviet Union, its essence and its meaning to the world, must be more fully understood, to make the U.S.-U.S.S.R. coalition stronger and more effective, to hasten the Second Front for a full victory of the coalition. The interests of the common struggle of

* Editorial of September 29, 1942.

* The allusion is to the character Oblomov, who, in Goncharov's famous novel by that name, typifies the social inertia, stagnation and indifferentism of nineteenth-century Russia.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United Nations and the deepening of American-Soviet amity require the fullest clarity upon the bases of our Soviet ally's heroic stand. The people must be armed against the veiled and open attempts to undermine America's vital relationship with the Soviet Union. The very launching of the Second Front — supreme urgency of the hour—and the shipping of vital war necessities to our Soviet ally are impeded by the Munichite propaganda of confusion and slander that is a danger to America and to the United Nations. The morale of our armed forces and of our civilian population depends on the speed and effectiveness with which we crush the traders in treason who, to distract attention from their organized plottings of a negotiated Hitler "peace," publish and broadcast such fabrications as that the "Russian enigma" makes us uncertain of the Soviet Union's course.

The cause of Allied unity demands the destruction of this tissue of falsehoods spun by the lose-the-war camp. The people must be grounded in the understanding that the Soviet Union is no "enigma," but that its course of action is straight, unfailing and clear-ringing as the fire from Lyudmila Pavlichenko's gun. There is still lacking a wide-scale grasp of the causes that make the Soviet Union, its fighting forces, its people and its leadership the object of world acclaim. It is clear to all that the Soviet Union is, and for sixteen fateful months has been, the mainstay of the United Nations' fighting strength; that "the hopes of civilization," in the words of General MacArthur, "rest on the worthy banners of the courageous Russian army." Not yet understood broadly is *how* this has been made possible.

* * *

The role of the Soviet Union in this war for national liberation is not an accidental, unexplainable phenomenon; it is the wartime expression of the fundamental role of the Socialist State in history.

The Soviet Union displays the fighting mettle that has earned for it world wonder because, founded on the principles of socialist democracy, it is the most consistent and resolute fighter against fascism; because the scientific bases on which its social system was built from the first are diametrically opposite and irreconcilably hostile to *everything* that fascism represents.

When, in *The Communist Manifesto,* close to a century ago, Marx and Engels foresaw that its historic course would lead the working class to assume "the position of ruling class," they predicated working class rule upon the basic task: "to win the battle of democracy." And when the proletariat of Russia raised itself to the position of ruling class, Lenin declared: "The Soviets are the higher form of democracy; moreover, they are the beginning of the *socialist* form of democracy."

The surge of the workers' state into existence brought to the laboring masses and all the oppressed everywhere the joyous realization that in a sixth of the world the age-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old aspirations of the "wretched of the earth" were now to be fulfilled. The revolutionary struggles of the modern working class, repressed in blood in the Parisian June Days of 1848, defeated on the barricades of the Communard "heaven stormers," crushed in the Russia of 1905, now had brought a proletariat to power. The freedom for which Spartacus led the embattled slave army in antiquity, for which Wat Tyler and Thomas Münzer led the serfs in sweeping struggle; the freedom that the Magna Carta initiated, that the great French Revolution proclaimed in the Rights of Man, that the American Revolution inscribed in words of fire on its battle banners—was now to be advanced to the highest stage of realization.

It is a tribute to the magnitude of the social transformation effected by the October Revolution that the voices—and not only the voices!—of all who stood in the way of progress were raised against the Soviet power. All too well known are the vilifications and malicious distortions, running the gamut from "nationalization of women" to "totalitarianism." One charge rose from them all: Soviet power, the dictatorship of the working class, means the end of all democracy!

Thus, even today, in the year of the Soviet people's glorious democratic apogee, the year of Sevastopol and Stalingrad, an "authority" on world affairs can deliver himself of this cynicism:

"From 1921 onwards [Russia's] example was followed by country after country which combined rebellion against the Versailles settlement with rejection of democracy, sometimes paying lip-service to democracy, as the Russians had done, by purporting to set up a new and more perfect form of it." *

One might expect that the lessons of the years, if they could not enlighten, would at least shame the slanderers. But the cheeks of falsehood are fashioned of brass.

Russia's example was the example of supreme democracy. The workers' state could not, *by its essential nature,* adopt a course other than the realization of the fullest democracy. The working class in power, the working class allied with the masses of the peasantry, means the rule of the vast majority.

A workers' state requires an organized form that corresponds to its political essence and implements its historic tasks. That form — evolved from the experiences of the Paris Commune and the Revolutions of 1905 and February, 1917, proposed and elaborated by Lenin, and instituted under his leadership—was Soviet power.

Lenin taught that in the course of winning the battle of democracy the Soviets, as the new state apparatus, are, in the first place, defending the gains of the Revolution, through having set up an armed force of workers and peasants—a force that "is not divorced from the people as was the old standing army, but is fused with the people in the closest possible fashion." Secondly, the Soviets are "a bond with the masses"

* Coward Hallett Carr, *Conditions of Peace,* Macmillan, New York, 1942, p. iv.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—the deep and indissoluble connection of the workers' state with the laboring people of city and village. Thirdly, the superior democratic character of the Soviets is reflected in the fact that their members are elected and subject to unhampered review and recall in accord with the popular will. Fourthly, their strong ties with the most varied occupations facilitate the introduction of reforms, free from bureaucratic formalism. Fifthly, their organizational form makes it possible for the vanguard of the laboring people, the proletariat, to extend leadership and political training to the vast peasant masses that previously "stood remote from political life and from history." Finally, in that they act both as legislative and executive bodies, as well as through the general flexibility of their form, they combine "the advantages of parliamentarism with the advantages of immediate and direct democracy." Summed up, the function of the workers' state and its Soviet form has been, from the beginning, as set forth in Lenin's "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," "to draw [the masses of the people] into independent political life, to educate them politically by their own experience," thereby "teaching the *whole* of the population the art of administration." *

The Soviet form of the workers' state—in realizing the objectives set forth by Lenin—has enabled the people to attain that unity of purpose and political initiative which alone explain their unshakable morale. It is the democratic basis of Soviet power which has made possible the firm, granite-like national unity of the Soviet people and the indestructible ties with its government and Red Army, such as have never been beheld.

* * *

The task of the workers' state to establish total democracy would have remained unachieved had the requisite economic foundation not been laid. Scientific communism is distinguished from utopianism in that it is enabled by the developing historical conditions, not only to project the consummate democracy, but to chart the course for realizing that democracy through the establishment of its material basis.

When, in 1926, toward the close of the period of economic restoration, effected by the New Economic Policy, the Land of the Soviets, led by the Bolshevik Party, undertook its great task of socialist construction, its enemies laughed. Some of its "friends" were skeptical at the "experiment." Bourgeois economic and sociological experts derided the Five-Year Plan and proved statistically, psychologically, biologically, that it was doomed to failure because, the profit motive lacking, the workers had no incentive to fulfill the Plan. Prophets of doom arose on all sides. The words of those oracles of ill-omen have now found their place with the ashes of history. The anti-Leninists within the party presented as insuperable the

* The distinguishing characteristics of the Soviets were classically presented by Lenin in his famous article "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?" written on the eve of the impending proletarian revolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic and technical backwardness of the country and raised the cry that the alliance of the working class and the peasantry would be disrupted; they clamorously denied the possibility of building socialism in the single Soviet State and set about organizing their ideological denial into practical betrayal. Defeated, repudiated and eliminated are the Trotsky-Bukharin camp of wreckers and traitors. The victorious advance of socialist construction reared the Soviet Union into a fortress of strength for the defense of world democracy. Without the achievement of socialist industrialization and of collectivization in agriculture, climaxed by the great Five-Year Plans, Hitler would today be the conqueror of the Soviet Union. Without the victory of the Stalinist party line, Britain and America would today be doomed lands at the mercy of Gauleiters.

In 1925, before the Five-Year Plans, Soviet industry was still much inferior in output and equipment to the industries of the leading capitalist countries; the economy of the U.S.S.R. was still a backward, predominantly agricultural economy. This meant that the workers' state was dependent on the hostile capitalist world for machinery, industrial materials, and many vital manufactured goods, including even the weapons of defense.

The socialist industrialization of the U.S.S.R., on which depended the success of Socialism and the defense of the workers' state, thus became the foremost task facing the Soviet people. The first partial goal, which was set in 1929, was the adoption of the First Five-Year Plan (first projected by the Party in 1927), which called for the modernization and expansion of industry, with special emphasis on two key industries: machine-building and "heavy industry" (mining, smelting, metal stock producing and heavy fabricating). In the four years and three months which sufficed to fulfill the Plan, industrial output approximately doubled. The Second Five-Year Plan, fulfilled in 1937, completed the reconstruction of the national economy on modern technical lines, doubled once again the volume of industrial production, and in particular achieved the mechanization of agriculture. It achieved its main historical task—the elimination of the remnants of the exploiting classes.

The great Plans, beside raising the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people, ensured the safety and future of the Soviet State. As events have emphatically demonstrated, the construction of the Soviet defenses was of crucial importance for all the anti-fascist peoples. Throughout the period of socialist construction, the greatest emphasis was placed, not only on building for the Red Army and Navy a great fighting machine, but on developing all industry with a view to rapid conversion, transplantation and regional self-sufficiency under the exigencies of national defense.

In the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., there is now inscribed the living reality that Socialist economy is the basis upon which the Soviet Union is established:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The socialist system of economy and socialist ownership of the means and instruments of production, *firmly established as a result of the* abolition of the capitalist system of economy, the abrogation of private ownership of the means and instruments of production and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, constitute the economic foundation of the U.S.S.R."

Upon this socialist economic bedrock rises the structure of socialist democracy.

"The right to work," declares the section on Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens, "is ensured by the socialist organization of the national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the elimination of the possibility of economic crises, and the abolition of unemployment."

The Constitution accords all citizens "the right to rest and leisure."

"The right to rest and leisure is ensured by the reduction of the working day to seven hours for the overwhelming majority of the workers, the institution of annual vacations with full pay for workers and employees and the provision of a wide network of sanatoria, rest homes and clubs for the accommodation of the working people."

The Constitution accords all citizens "the right to maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work."

"This right is ensured by the extensive development of social insurance of workers and employees at state expense, free medical service for the working people and the provision of a wide network of health resorts for the use of the working people."

The Constitution ensures for all citizens "freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda."

The Constitution guarantees by law to all citizens freedom of speech, press, assembly and street demonstrations.

"These civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communications facilities and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights."

The "right to unite in public organizations—trade unions, cooperative associations," and other organizations is ensured to all citizens:

"In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to develop the organizational initiative and political activity of the masses of the people."

In regard to the rights of woman —"the chained Andromeda of modern society," De Leon called her— the Constitution states:

"Women in the U.S.S.R. are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life.

"The possibility of exercising these rights is ensured to women by granting them an equal right with men to work, payment for work, rest and leisure, social insurance and education, and by state protection of the interests of mother and child, pre-maternity and ma-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ternity leave with full pay, and the provision of a wide network of maternity homes, nurseries and kindergartens."

In the basic respect of rendering the constitutional rights of the Soviet citizen, in the economic, political and social spheres, *ensured* rights—not merely rights formally recorded, but rights whose exercise is made actually possible and is legally guaranteed—socialist democracy transcends every form of democracy society has known.

The socialist democracy flourishes upon the soil of the great community of interests that unites the Soviet people in an indestructible unity.

The new working class of the U.S.S.R. (no longer, as Stalin pointed out, a proletariat, a term connoting a class bereft of the means of production and hence exploited), is now, in conjunction with the entire people, the master of the country's resources and productive implements, for whom labor has been elevated to "a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a matter of valor and heroism." This new working class, with ranks unified, asserting its initiative and leadership through its free and democratic trade unions and other organizations, its politically most conscious members united with other advanced sections of the working people in the vanguard Bolshevik Party, and knowing itself to be part of the world working class, is achieving miracles on the production front and is manning the guns on the Soviet sector of the United Nations' battlefront.

And it is this working class—to the shame of American labor, it must be said—which has been found wanting by the majority of the American Federation of Labor leadership! It is this vanguard section of the world trade union movement whom the Hutchesonian trade union tyrants label "totalitarian"!

Well did Jack Tanner, fraternal delegate from the British Trade Union Congress to the recent A. F. of L. Convention, answer all such blockers of cooperation among the trade unions of the United Nations:

"We are proud to be associated with that brave people through our trade union organization, and if we are told that the character and spirit of their trade unions is different from that of the British trade unions, I can only reply that the character and spirit of the Soviet trade unionists in the fight against Hitlerism are also somewhat different from what our own has been to date. . . .

"To say that the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. are nothing but appendages to the state machinery is to leave out of account the nature of the state and whose interests its activities foster and serve. In our two countries, we cannot pretend that it is the workers' interests which will triumph in any issue, unless we put up a strong and organized fight. But there is no evidence to support the idea that in the Soviet Union such a fight is necessary if the matter is one which concerns the well-being of the workers, and if it is not necessary, the organizations which, in other countries and conditions, would conduct such fights, naturally assume a different

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character and take on different activities."*

The victory of socialism emancipated the village with the town. The backward, scattered peasant husbandry which was the norm of the economy—until 1930 predominantly agrarian—became transformed into large-scale, collective, socialist agriculture. With this deep-going revolution in the national economy, "equivalent in its consequence to the revolution of October, 1917," the Soviet peasantry became transformed into a peasantry of a new type. The victory of the collective farm movement, aided materially, culturally and morally by the working class and the Soviet Government, has freed the peasant masses from exploitation and from oppression by landlords and usurers. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R. declares all collective farm enterprises, with their livestock and implements, as well as their products and buildings, to be the socialist property of the collective farms; it declares the land occupied by the collective farms to be secured to them free in perpetuity. The Soviet peasants have not only achieved a life of well-being; their life has become permeated with modern culture. From the ranks of the new peasantry have come forward leading, educated citizens in the various professions. And from the Soviet fields and villages have come millions of patriots, imbued with love for their fatherland, sworn to annihilate the fascist invader. The socialist patriotism of the peasantry finds its noblest symbol in the man, who, born the son of Bessarabian peasants, and at one time a farmhand, is now — Marshal Timoshenko.

Of that patriotism, Ralph Parker, Moscow correspondent of *The New York Times*, wrote early this year:

"The peasants destroyed things because they were confident that the state would restore their means of livelihood. Socialism stands or falls by its capacity to provide work, and the Russian worker or peasant has come to expect that the state will take care of him. Indeed, there is a strong case to be made for the theory that only in socialist states is a scorched-earth policy possible on a complete scale. Certainly the collectivization of land facilitates the tragic and heroic acts of self-sacrifice that Premier Joseph Stalin ordered to weaken the foe."*

The rise of the socialist democracy necessarily involved, side by side with the basic transformation in the national economy, a revolution in the sphere of culture. "The October Revolution," declared Stalin, "is not only a revolution in the domain of economic and social-political relations; it is at the same time a revolution in the minds, a revolution in the ideology, of the working class." The new society required the new man—and begot him.

Socialist construction provided the material basis and released the social forces for the cultural revolution. Socialist democracy means today, as current Soviet life mag-

* *The Worker*, October 11, 1942.

* *The New York Times*, February 2, 1942.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nificently demonstrates, the people's democratic initiative and participation in the development of their cultural resources and activities for strengthening the struggle for national liberation.

The Soviet Constitution accords all citizens "the right to education."

"This right is ensured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language, and by the organization in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms of free vocational technical and agronomic training for the working people."

That this provision in the Constitution has been made a reality is demonstrated by the unprecedented advance of culture in the Soviet Union. By the end of the Second Five-Year Plan, illiteracy, which characterized 70 per cent of the population in 1913, had decreased to less than 5 per cent; the number of primary and secondary school pupils had increased from 8,000,000 to nearly 30,000,000; the number of college and university students had grown to 550,000—greater by almost 25 per cent than the combined total attendance in the corresponding institutions of England, France, Germany, Italy and Japan; and the number of readers had increased to such an extent that the books in the Soviet libraries amounted to 75 for every 100 inhabitants. The Red Army, a vast school and cultural force in itself, had over 30,000,000 books in its libraries. The scientific, planned socialist economy, inaugurated through the zealous participation of the people, has built up a mass scientific attitude and has vastly stimulated and released the nation's cultural forces. From the 3,000 professional scientists that prerevolutionary Russia counted, the number had risen at the time of the launching of the Third Five-Year Plan to 40,000.

Out of the ranks of the liberated workers and peasants has come a new intelligentsia, working integrally with the people, drawing its incentive and inspiration from the people and serving the people's cause. And of the old intelligentsia the best elements either identified themselves from the first with the October Revolution or, through their growing realization of what socialism spells for culture and for themselves as cultural workers, have come over to the side of the socialist people.

The culture of the socialist society is no facade of enlightenment to conceal a house of darkness. It is an edifice shining from foundation to spire with the truth of free man's achievements. It is no hierarchy of the élite, the "experts," over a people bidden to remain in passivity. It is a life activity of a unified people fashioning its destiny consciously.

The democratic roots of the socialist culture and the vital meaning of culture for the socialist people are attested by the tremendous role of the sciences and the arts in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the great struggle of the Soviet Union for national liberation. Soviet cultural activities are not promoted as "a sleep and a forgetting." Nor are they an artificial stimulus to the popular morale. The culture of socialist democracy speaks out of the people; it is their deep will to victory creating—creating not only to celebrate the Red Army's and the nation's heroic deeds, but also to utter criticism where criticism is due, to correct, to suggest, to urge, to achieve.

Striking is the instance of a recent play by Alexander Korneichuk, *The Front*, published in *Pravda* and scheduled for immediate nation-wide production. *The Front*, in presenting the heroic exploits of the Red Army and its leadership, lays bare, with ruthless criticism, shortcomings in certain commanders — military conservatism coupled with self-complacency—which have hindered the rout of the invaders and have been responsible for some of the defeats suffered by the Red Army.

"The play," a review in *Pravda* states, "sets every worker thinking, makes him take a critical view of his shortcomings, and fires him with the striving steadily to improve his work. . . . The publication of Korneichuk's *The Front* is a sign of the great strength and vitality of the Red Army and of the Soviet State; for only an army which confidently faces the future, which is confident in victory, can disclose its own shortcomings so frankly and sharply in order to eliminate them." *

In the Soviet Union the search for truth is a moral and political obligation. Self-criticism is the oxygen of socialist democracy. The people's culture is ever self-examining, self-renewing, self-expanding.

The Soviet Union has solved the national question! This sentence epitomizes for the peoples of the world an achievement unequaled in the whole history of the struggle of nations for independent life and self-development. Proceeding from the simple truth enunciated by Marx that no nation oppressing another can be free, Lenin and Stalin formulated the scientific program which led to the opening of the tsar's Bastille of nations and brought the freed peoples comprising a hundred and fifty nationalities into a voluntary fraternal Union of equal republics, a socialist commonwealth.

In regard to the rights of the nations and peoples embraced in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Constitution provides:

"Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

In that multi-national Union the anti-fascist United Nations can behold the fullest fraternal cooperation among the varied great and

* *The Worker*, October 11, 1942.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

small nationalities. They can see, in place of the policies of spoliation, obscurantism,* pogroms, and forcible "Russification" carried on by tsarist imperialism among the oppressed non-Russian nationalities, the economic, political and cultural regeneration of the nationalities which was effected by the Soviet Government. They can see the wholesome unity of nations risen in defense of the common fatherland, where no second-rank citizenship degrades any single people and weakens the fighting capacity of the entire land; where no discrimination is directed at a people of a darker skin, sapping the vitality of the all-national war effort; where no anti-Semitism brings the poison of Hitlerism into the camp warring upon Hitler; where no colonies exist to become a stamping-ground for Axis "liberation" demagoguery. They can see the living reality of the declaration by Stalin:

". . . the draft of the new Constitution of the U.S.S.R. is . . . profoundly internationalistic. It proceeds from the proposition that all nations and races have equal rights. It proceeds from the fact that neither difference in color nor language, cultural level, or level of political development, nor any other difference between nations and races, can serve as grounds for justifying national inequality of rights. It proceeds from the proposition that all nations and races, irrespective of their past and present position, irrespective of their strength or weakness, should enjoy equal rights in all spheres of the economic, social, political and cultural life of society."

* * *

The profoundly democratic character of the Soviet Union marks also its foreign policy. The protection of the vital national interests of the U.S.S.R. has always coincided with the needs for national security on the part of all peoples. By its non-imperialist essence, the workers' state at all times safeguarded its people and territory without plundering foreign lands or interfering in their domestic affairs. Notable in this connection is the "Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia," by which the week-old Soviet Government, on November 16, 1917, accorded the nationalities the right to self-determination and separation. [When, a month and a half later, the Finnish Parliament declared Finland's independence, the Soviet Government, within two days (January 2, 1918) extended its recognition.] Notable too is the Soviet Union's renunciation of tsarist Russia's traditional annexationist policies with regard to the Dardanelles and with regard to Port Arthur and Dairen. And in full keeping with its continuous policy of friendship for the Chinese people, the Soviet Union early renounced the tsarist policy with regard to China. Thus, in 1919, when the Red Army pursued the Kolchakist White Guards in the direc-

* Revealing is this passage from a confidential report submitted to Nicholas I by the Chief of the Fifth Gendarmerie Corps "on the condition of the aliens inhabiting the Kazan Gubernia": "Experience of all times proves that it is easier to rule an ignorant people than a people that has received even the slightest degree of education. . . . In accordance with this precept the authorities over the Chuvash people are exerting every effort to keep them in ignorance."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the Far East, the Soviet government issued a declaration to China by which it rejected all claims to the Boxer indemnity and other special privileges. In 1922, the Soviet Union renounced all treaties of the tsarist government with China, declaring itself "willing to return to China without compensation all Chinese territory seized by the tsar." This declaration was embodied in the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of May 31, 1924, by which China was for the first time accorded the status of a first-rank Power. The principle actuating these steps has marked every alliance or pact into which the Soviet Government has entered.

"We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country." These words of Stalin, spoken in March, 1939, at the Eighteenth Party Congress, have been abundantly corroborated by Soviet policy throughout the years. The assistance that the Soviet Union has continuously rendered, and is still rendering, to the Chinese nation in its war of salvation, is a factor that will contribute vastly to bring victory to that heroic people. Writing in *Liberty* for December 21, 1940, Madame Chiang Kai-shek stated:

"Intellectual honesty constrains me to point out that throughout the first three years of resistance Soviet Russia extended to China, for the actual purchase of war materials and other necessities, credits several times larger in amount than the credits given by either Great Britain or America."

Memorable are the unflagging efforts of the Soviet Union and its representative, Litvinov, at the League of Nations in behalf of invaded Ethiopia to bring about a complete blockade of fascist Italy.

When the democratic capitalist governments, abetted by Social-Democratic leaders, engaged in that accommodation to the fascist invasion of Spain hypocritically styled "Non-Intervention," the Soviet Union declared through its representative on the Non-Intervention Committee, on October 7, 1936:

"The Soviet Government cannot consent to the conversion of the non-interference pact into a screen for concealing military assistance to the Rebels against the legal government by some participants in the agreement."

And the Soviet Government acted upon that declaration. It sent guns and planes to the Spanish democrats, who faced Hitler's and Mussolini's mechanized forces almost unarmed. Soviet technicians and instructors went to their aid. Soviet ships brought food to the blockaded Spanish people. Spain and the world will forever remember the staunch struggle of the Soviet Union on the side of the Spanish people.

Dr. Eduard Benes, the former Czechoslovakian President, on arriving in the United States, revealed in an authorized interview with Erika Mann, published in the Chicago *Daily News* on April 18, 1939, that the Soviet Union had stood ready to carry out its pledge of military assistance to Czechoslo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vakia even if France and Britain failed her. "Russia was faithful to the very last moment," the account of the interview quoted Dr. Benes as saying.

These actions of support to weaker nations attacked by fascism were an integral part of the Soviet Union's magnificent fight for collective security.

Today, as the United Nations look back amid the flames of war to those crucial years, can they fail to see that had the upraised fist of the People's Front, not the bribing palm of appeasement, been put forward; had the counsels of Moscow, not of Munich, been heeded; had the aggressor been quarantined—the hordes of Hitler would not now be riding roughshod over the bodies of nations?

The anti-Hitler alliance today of the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States at the head of the United Nations is history's verdict of the correctness of the collective security policy which the Soviet Union urged the nations to adopt against fascist aggression.

Likewise, history has already confirmed the wisdom of the U.S.S.R. in signing the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. Let those who still persist in representing that pact as a "skeleton in the closet" be reminded of the facts:

Up to the last the Soviet Government endeavored to maintain the Peace Front of the democratic nations. The policies of the Munichite camp had sabotaged and utterly dismembered that front, and it became manifest that peace could no longer be preserved on the basis of collective security. The maneuvers of the reactionaries who were at the helm of the British, French and Polish Governments were cynically directed at coming to terms on another Munich basis with Hitler at the expense of the Soviet Union, at isolating the Soviet Union and plunging her into a war of attrition with Hitler Germany. The last stage in the tragic rejection of collective security was the Anglo-French-Soviet military discussions of the summer of 1939, in which every effort of the Soviet Union to implement the Peace Front and to obtain workable joint guarantees of Poland against Nazi aggression was blocked. The Soviet Union adopted an independent policy and took the step which frustrated the designs of the imperialist intriguers.

As events have well shown, that Non-Aggression Pact, far from being, as the enemies of the Soviet Union rushed to proclaim, a move of "capitulation" to Hitler, was based, as Stalin pointed out in his radio address of July 3, 1941, "on one indispensable condition, namely, that this peace treaty does not infringe either directly or indirectly on the territorial integrity, independence and honor of the peace-loving states." Far from being "inimical" to the interests of the anti-Hitler forces, it was, on the part of the Soviet Government, that master-stroke which enabled the Soviet Union to strengthen its strategic position and to prepare its fighting power for the day of Hitler's onslaught, to prepare that power for the war, not only of its own

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national liberation, but of England, America and all the United Nations.

During that entire period and up to the time when it was treacherously attacked, the Soviet Union pursued a policy designed to prevent the spread of the war and to strengthen the democratic forces in struggle against fascism. It supported the national liberation struggle of the Yugoslav people and endeavored to bring about an all-Balkan anti-Hitler coalition. It continued its aid to China. It liberated Byelorussia, Western Ukraine, Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina from the toils of reaction and the imminent threat of Nazi enslavement. It supported Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia in their struggle for national and social liberation; established mutual assistance pacts with these Baltic states marked out as points of attack against the Soviet Union; and on the basis of their plebiscitary request admitted the three new Soviet republics into the great family of free nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It frustrated and defeated the Nazi-Finnish intrigues and provocative attacks which were abetted by the Chamberlain-Bonnet imperialist forces. The blow struck then against the Finnish fascists—the smashing of the redoubtable Mannerheim Line, the protection of the Soviet border, and the safeguarding of Leningrad—was a blow struck in behalf of the United Nations of today.

During that entire period the Soviet Union maintained vigilance on its own frontiers, strengthening its Red Army and its defenses against all contingencies, and standing as a great barrier to Hitler's drive for engulfing the Balkans and the strategic Middle East, which would have meant disaster for Great Britain and the United Nations of today. By thus immobilizing a considerable part of the Nazi army, the Soviet Union contributed to holding back Hitler's invasion of England and his preparations for the attack upon the Americas. Hitler himself admitted in his Proclamation of June 22, 1941, that it was the Soviet Union which had prevented him from conquering Britain:

"While our soldiers from May 10, 1940, onwards had been breaking the power of France and Britain in the west, the Russian military deployment on our eastern frontier was being continued to a more and more menacing extent. From August, 1940, onwards I therefore considered it to be in the interests of the Reich no longer to permit our eastern provinces to remain unprotected in the face of this tremendous concentration of Bolshevik divisions. Thus came about the result intended by the British and Russian cooperation —namely, *the tying up of such powerful German forces in the east that the radical conclusion of the war in the west, particularly as regards aircraft, could no longer be vouched for by the German High Command.*"

What a travesty on history is therefore the statement in a column of *The New York Times* (September 20, 1942): "Britain saved herself in 1940 without Russian aid, without important American aid. Britain saved herself when she stood alone." And what more fitting comment is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needed on the contribution of every such statement to the cause of the United Nations than the fact that that very column is now being circulated in thousands of broadsides by the fascist Christian Front?

On June 22, 1941, the Soviet Union took up arms against the Nazi invader.

On July 3 Stalin spoke to the world:

"Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties.

"It will be a united front of peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement and threats of enslavement by Hitler's fascist armies."

A united front of peoples!

The war of the peoples against Hitlerism has proclaimed *collective security* as its rallying slogan! The struggles of the nations for survival have merged—into one war indivisible, one camp indivisible.

The Atlantic, which once was vaunted by isolators as our ocean barricade, has become the symbol of a Charter of the embattled United Nations—a Charter which must be made to extend to the Pacific. The policies of the Munichmen to isolate and attack the Soviet Union have been transformed into the historic Pacts and Agreements of Britain and the United States with the Soviet Union. In place of the unnatural division between the two great democracies—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—which the helpmates of Hitler long sought to foster, have arisen the natural friendship and the fighting alliance of both nations.

This natural friendship has its basis in the immediate and lasting community of interests of the two great democratic peoples—a truth expressed continuously for years by Earl Browder.

Today it is broadly and increasingly recognized that the deepest principles of freedom and democracy actuate the men, women and children of the Soviet Union in their struggle to destroy the fascist invader. A few miserable and distorted creatures, like Lady Astor and that aspirant to the role of an American Doriot, Norman Thomas, venomously attempt to deny this. Such denial does not get far with the soldiers and sailors in the American armed forces, who take their hats off to the Soviet Union. The makers of guns and tanks and planes, the workers in civilian defense, the wives and sweethearts of our soldiers and sailors—the people on our home front: these spoke through Wendell Willkie their confidence in the Soviet Union and its leader, Joseph Stalin, in the land where the people run the people's war; where the Fifth Column has been extirpated in good season; where the Red Army, the people's army, fights with a morale based on the knowledge that for democracy to live, fascism must be ruthlessly annihilated.

The example of the Soviet Union shows us that democracy gives the people the will to destroy those who would destroy it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Military campaigns, hailed by MacArthur as "the greatest military achievement in all history"—heroism unparalleled on the part, not only of a magnificently trained and politically enlightened army, but of an entire people—these can be explained only by the fact that these people fight for the country which they collectively and democratically rule—"street by street, and house by house." Only democracy—democracy of a kind never known before in history—democracy rooted in the bedrock of common ownership of the country's resources and means of production—democracy spread over a broad framework of popular participation in all phases of government—democracy backed by the strength of free, equal, and united nations—such democracy has been able to give to the Soviet people the stamina and the stature they show in this greatest war of all times. After twenty-five years of Soviet power, the Russian people demonstrate with blow after blow, with retreat only to attack again, that they cannot be beaten; such a people will not go under; they are knit together in the vast indestructible morale of their Socialist democracy.

But day by day the price our Soviet ally is forced to pay through the non-realization of full coalition strategy is rising. Our Ally's costs are our costs. His peril is our peril.

Stalingrad, hard-pressed defender of the cities of democracy, calls to London, New York, Washington, San Francisco. Its call stings us to remember the words of General MacArthur:

"The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words: Too late . . . Too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance: Too late in standing with one's friends."*

Shall we be too late in standing with our friends?

The course for America is clear.

"We now hold the keys to an adequate policy for winning the war. These keys are: The American-Soviet-British Pacts and alliance—the bulwark of the United Nations and of world democracy; the Washington and London Agreements to open the Second Front in Europe and to extend all-out aid to China. With the fulfillment of these historic agreements, we will have a guiding policy for victory."

So spoke Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party and chief protagonist for the fullest development of American-Soviet friendship.

On this Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Soviet Union's founding, the American working class and people are eager to join the Soviet people in fighting comradeship on the Western Front for the decisive blow against fascism and the complete triumph of the coalition of the democratic nations.

---

* *The Officer's Guide*, 9th edition, July, 1942; The Military Service Publishing Co., Hatrisburg, Pa.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR NATION DISCOVERS THE SOVIET UNION

BY HANS BERGER

THE discovery of America at the end of the fifteenth century altered the entire aspect of the world. Had we as a nation discovered the Soviet Union, as we are beginning to do today, a quarter of a century, or at least five years, or even three years ago, we should probably have a different world than the one we now behold. Today, one no longer need be a Communist or a "suspicious character" in order to appreciate this fact. Dorothy Thompson, in a speech delivered at Tanglewood, Lenox, Massachusetts, on August 25, 1942, thus put into words what millions today are thinking:

"The greatest disservice was done to the democracies by those who believed in the fascist accounts of Russia. It was said that Russia had no armaments, no air force, that the Russian people were on the verge of revolt, that it would morally collapse in the first weeks of war.

"The greatest tragedy of this war, and one for which we have paid with unlimited suffering, and will continue to pay with more suffering, was the breaking of the French-Russian alliance at Munich. It made this war certain and inevitable. In September, 1938, an aggressive Germany—had the European treaties not been abrogated at Munich—would have had what she could not face: a two-front war. From that day until now, it has been impossible to have a two-front war on Germany."

But with respect to the Soviet Union, we as a nation, and especially those who were looked upon as our most authoritative spokesmen, were asuredly no Columbus. Toward the U.S.S.R. we failed to display that undaunted, forward-surging pioneer spirit with which our forefathers were so richly endowed. There was no good reason why we should not have recognized, years before we did, the historical rôle of the Soviet Union, as Vice-President Wallace, for example, recognized it in his famous speech of June 1, 1942, a speech that has been passed over in dead silence by the greater part of the press:

"The march of freedom of the past 150 years has been a long-drawn-out people's revolution. In this Great Revolution of the people, there were the American Revolution of 1775, the French Revolution of 1792, the Latin American revolutions of the Bolivarian era, the German Revolution of 1848, and the Russian Revolution of 1918. Each spoke for the common man in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terms of blood on the battlefield. Some went to excess. But the significant thing is that the people groped their way to the light. More of them learned to think and work together."

Yet it was not until the year 1933 that we finally made up our minds to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and the President who was responsible for this was looked upon as taking a very bold step, indeed. Hoover and his kind to this day cannot forgive him for it.

We Communists have never hesitated about confessing our mistakes and shortcomings, when the occasion called for it. Is it not about time that all those who did so much to create a misunderstanding of the Soviet Union were giving a little self-analysis to the matter? What a sorry rôle was played by so many of our scholars and scientists, by so large a part of our press, our literature, our radio, our motion pictures, our political parties, by so many trade union leaders, churches, schools, and universities with respect to the U.S.S.R. during all these twenty-five years!

The Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Robert A. Lovett, at a meeting of the Bankers' Club — at which, incidentally, he met with warm applause—thus formulated in sarcastic terms the ignorance which our country has displayed in the past with reference to the Soviet Union:

"Two American officers in their official report said that 'from observation of the work of the Russian mechanics one could conclude that in certain respects they surpassed American crews in their mechanical intuition. Their ability to repair any and all difficulties was phenomenal.'

"No doubt the information that those officers had on Russia came from those outrageous old geographies we studied in the sixth grade, you remember, under the heading of 'Characteristics of the Inhabitants.' About the middle of the page opposite the map the comments on Russia were about as follows: 'The Russians are a people largely given to agricultural pursuits. In winter the country is covered with snow and a type of sled, called the troika, is a common mode of travel.' Equipped with such pearls of knowledge, it is little wonder we were ripe for surprise."

It was not, however, merely a matter of ignorance with us; it was what we in this country thought we "knew" about the Soviet Union; it was our prejudices, our lack of understanding, our Philistinism that made the relations of our country with our Russian Soviet ally of today so full of tragic and fatal mistakes, thereby contributing to the world situation with which we now find ourselves confronted. If, after this war is over, an academy should be founded with the object of investigating the causes of the war, these learned academicians will surely find themselves in possession of a flood of literature of all sorts, a flood of propaganda of every conceivable form against the Soviet Union, of a kind that has been produced in our country for the past twenty-five years. This academy would indeed be in a position to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compile an encyclopedia of lies, slanders, and falsifications, and for material they need only turn to Hearst's lynch-law press, to the "distinguished" literary section of *The New York Times,* or they may avail themselves of certain allegedly profound "scientific" treatises, hypocritical sermons, open incitations to pogroms, statements by attorney-generals, warnings issued by trade union leaders against the establishment of relations with the Soviets, lurid romances à la Jan Valtin, etc., etc. Can one, for example, realize that even today there are people who would try to make out that the Soviet government is settling Jews in Biro-Bidjan in order that they may serve as cannon-fodder in case of a Japanese attack?

There was, of course, not the slightest reason for our being surprised at the Soviet Union, when in hundreds of books, newspaper articles, speeches—not by Communists, but by men and women of the most diverse shades of opinion—the development of the U.S.S.R. was to be found depicted in all its enormous diversity. The possibility of learning the truth about the Soviets, betimes, was all the time at hand, but the great majority of our people were not in a position to grasp it. For in this democracy of ours, in which, unfortunately, Big Business and its ideologists so largely control public opinion, by means of the press, the movies, the radio, and the like, about nine out of ten persons, more or less, were likely in mental darkness regarding our Soviet ally. That a country in which there is no private property in the means of production should have made such giant forward strides and should display so high a degree of technical, moral, and cultural development, was something which our people must not come to know. That the Soviet Union was a land constituting the bulwark of civilization and progress must similarly be kept from them. What obstacles we Communists encountered when, in the interest of our own country and the war for human freedom, we attempted to spread the truth about the Land of Socialism; how strenuously we had to combat the campaign of lies, slander, and calumnies. We were in a position similar to that of the great abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, with regard to slavery. When a friend said to him, "You are too excited, you are on fire," Garrison replied, "I have need to be on fire, for I have icebergs around me to melt."

The fire of war is beginning to melt our own national iceberg at an unprecedented rate of speed. In the fire of war, in the face of the heroic rôle that the Soviet Union is playing in the fight for freedom, our prejudices against the Land of Socialism are being consumed as by flame. It is an incontrovertible fact that the majority of our people are deeply democratic, deeply anti-fascist, and that they want to see the war against Hitler carried forward to a victorious conclusion; whence the admiration which they feel for their Soviet Russian ally, their desire to understand the Soviet Union better. Even the Chi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cago *Tribune*, the *Daily News*, the Hearst press and the like are compelled, much against their will, to contribute to the strengthening of this admiration for our Russian friends and to publish facts that lead to a better understanding. For they must daily bring news of the "Russian Reds'" heroic stand. Even they cannot withhold from their readers the epic battle of Stalingrad. They cannot keep the people from knowing that the socialistic Soviet Union is the one power in the world up to now which has been able to halt the Nazi armies.

The poor white in the South, chock full of prejudices that have been crammed into him by the descendants of the slaveholders, the poor farmer in the Middle West, the previously backward worker in a small inland town, even Mr. Babbitt himself—they have all been hearing now for fifteen months of the heroic resistance of the people concerning whom, for the past twenty-five years, they had been accustomed to hear only the worst. All these misinformed millions are now engaged in drawing the correct conclusions for themselves, and in doing so display a hundred times more wisdom than do the gang of "scholarly" hacks who for so long now have been sniping away at the Soviet Union. What are these conclusions? The Soviet Russians know what they are fighting for. These are not those downtrodden Slavs, "languishing under Stalin's tyranny," these Red soldiers who would rather die than surrender, these embattled workers and peasants, women and children. And so they go on to reason in their own simple fashion: a country which can withstand so terrible an onslaught must have an outstanding military and industrial organization; it must have outstanding experts and leaders, with the confidence of the people behind them. A country whose population is made up of so many different nationalities, and which yet, amid the flames of a terrible war, in spite of retreats and setbacks, has so few traitors in its midst—such a country must have found the key to the brotherhood of nations. The great writer Pearl Buck has put these conclusions of our people into the following beautiful words:

"The Russian people in this war for freedom are setting an example for all of us because they are fighting as a united people without prejudice of race. As an American this means more for me than anything else."

What a longing breathes from these words: a longing that we, the American people, might be able to heal our own form of the disease of racial prejudice, in the manner of our Soviet ally.

Even the malicious attempt to bring up the question of religion against the Soviet Union, and to make this serve as a barrier to American-Soviet friendship, has come to naught. It is by no accident that we hear the prominent Catholic Alfred E. Smith making the statement: "The Russian Army and people are serving magnificently as the spearhead of our fight."

It is no exaggeration to assert that the attitude of our nation to-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward the Soviet Union has changed, *fundamentally*. The knowledge of the Soviet Union that is possessed by a relatively small minority will more and more redound to the benefit of the vast majority of our people, and an alliance with the Soviets will no longer appear as something "criminal," but as a progressive step. The U.S.S.R. no longer appears as a mysterious Colossus, endeavoring day and night to overthrow our democratic institutions. Today it is seen to be the best ally that we could have in this our war for national survival. Archibald MacLeish has put it this way:

"It is time, finally, to say to those who would divide the Americans from the Russians and the Russians from the Americans because they differ in their institutions and in the concepts of their lives, that it is precisely because of this difference—precisely because of this open and public and admitted difference—that the union of the Russian and American peoples is a powerful weapon in this war and a triumphant symbol of the meaning of this struggle."

The great majority of our people are beginning to realize that the Soviet Union is not fighting for "Red imperialist aims," as Hoover would have us believe; that it is not even fighting for its own freedom alone, but *for the freedom of all mankind*. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, was speaking in the name of the American people, when he declared:

"The heroic resistance of the Russian people to the international bandits has aroused the admiration of the world. Our Russian allies are fighting successfully not only for themselves but also for the rest of mankind. We must spare no effort to give them every aid and encouragement in their epic struggle against savagery."

And even though William Green, head of the A. F. of L., does not as yet clearly see the role of the Russian workers and the Russian trade unions, he nonetheless understands very well the meaning of American-Soviet friendship:

"This is a people's war. The people of America and the Russian people are in the same boat. They will share their resources generously, just as they will share the glory of victory triumphantly."

It was the very heart of our nation speaking, when Senator Claude Pepper's words rang out:

"When free men hereafter, in a free world, linger upon the record of this convulsive era, no name will be more luminous than that of Russia. . . . As one looks back over the wreckage of the last decade, one can now appreciate, however, what a Herculean effort Russia made to arouse the rest of the world against Hitler's accelerated machine."

Our own people are beginning to realize, in spite of all the attempts that are still being made to have it appear that the Soviet Union is a "totalitarian dictatorship," that the people of the Soviet Union have forged for themselves a life that is worth fighting and dying for, and that it is this way of life which *enables* them to fight the way they do against so formidable an adver-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sary. How many lies and humbug tales have been strung together to make it appear that Stalin is a "bloodthirsty villain"; yet today there are comparatively few Americans who do not have the deepest respect for Stalin's greatness, farsightedness and iron will.

Millions also are discovering today that the Soviet Union does not "destroy the family" as they had been told, but that it rather defends the family and confers upon it social security. They are discovering that in all the realms of art and culture the Soviet Union has tremendous achievements to show, and that, in the domain of technological development, in spite of the fact that it has had only a quarter of a century's experience, it is not far behind ourselves. Millions of our people are beginning to realize that these "Reds" have developed prodigious skills, as was shown by more than one young fighter at Stalingrad. At the same time, they could not help noting that, even as the battle for Stalingrad was in progress, an effort was afoot in our own Congress to raise the cost of living for the American people! These are the kind of things that, as this war goes on, are not likely to be forgotten!

It goes without saying that, even today, it is not made easy for some of our people to understand the "miracle" of the Soviet Union, as the Dean of Canterbury in his book has described it, in so wonderfully clear and simple a fashion. How ridiculous it would seem to us, if Soviet journalists were to undertake to deny that we in this country have the highest degree of technological development and the most powerful industry in the world—all because the capitalist system still happens to exist with us. On the contrary, it is a well known fact that the Soviet Union admires our technological achievements and has learned much from them, despite the fact that we live under a system of monopoly capitalism. Still today we find not a few people—and not all of them in the ranks of the appeasers, by any means—who, having been forced to forget their old stupidities regarding the U.S.S.R., would now endeavor to trig them out in new garments. These gentlemen are to be heard discussing in all seriousness the question as to whether the Russian people fight so valiantly *because* they have a socialist system, or *in spite of the fact* that they have such a system. The reason for such discussions is clear: these gentlemen fear that our own people may come to have "dangerous thoughts," to the effect that it takes a socialist order of society to produce such a nation of heroes, along with the efficiency necessary to withstand so formidable an enemy. These gentlemen still shudder at the thought that the *Bolshevik* Soviet Union is our friend, and that it today stands in the forefront of the battle of humanity. One need not be a Communist in order to clear up such speculations as these concerning the "miracle" of the Soviet Union, with its Russian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Turkmenian, Bashkir, Kalmuk, and all its other nationalities. Mr. Ralph Barton Perry has given a complete and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quite remarkable answer to this kind of thinking, in a letter to *The New York Times* of July 8, 1942:

"But the heart of the matter is our attitude toward communism itself. It is commonly said that Russia has renounced communism and reverted to nationalism. That the present struggle has drawn upon the older and deeper reserves of Russian patriotism and blurred the lines between Red and White is no doubt true. But it would be foolish and dangerous to count upon the adoption of a capitalistic democracy in Russia. It appears probable that the present unity of Russia is largely the product of her communistic faith; that a military victory will confirm that faith in the sentiment and conviction of the Russian people. If we are to avoid wishful thinking and avert a revival of old antipathies we must come to an understanding not with a Russia fashioned on our own model but with a communistic Russia. That is the other pier on which we must hope to build a bridge of agreement."

The attempt to deny the socialist character of the Soviet Union, the attempt to explain its heroism "in spite of its socialist character," the attempt to predict a capitalistic future for it, *means to resume once more the old war against the Soviet Union.* In the flames of war, the iceberg of our prejudices is rapidly melting. This is an undeniable fact. On the other hand, nothing could be more dangerous than to assume that the reactionaries, the appeasers, the narrow-minded ones and those who never learn anything, will not make use of every means and take advantage of every opportunity to halt and nullify this course of development, to sow the seeds of new hatreds and dissensions—in short, to breathe new life into the old abandoned prejudices. *This is particularly evident right now in connection with the question of opening a Second Front.*

It is evident, also, in the case of those who are ready to "praise to death" the Soviet Union. Beneath this is concealed their desire to fight the present war "to the last Russian," along with a plethora of compliments and laudatory speeches. Such praise would have represented a brave gesture some years ago, but it counts for little at a time when Stalingrad is there to speak for itself. As soon as they find they can get no further along this line, the faces of these gentlemen are no longer wreathed in smiles of praise, and instead we hear from them a glacial laughter and cynical remarks.

The Hearst press, the Chicago *Tribune,* the *Daily News,* and similar organs engage in the crudest efforts to make the people believe that the Soviet Union is trying to force the Allies into a "suicidal action," by demanding the opening of a Second Front.

The tempo and degree of stability of our friendship with the Soviet Union is bound to prove decisive for the outcome of this war for our own national existence; it is bound to be a decisive factor in the shaping and development of the after-war world. *That is why the fact that a veritable revolution in the thinking of our people on the subject of the Soviet*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union is already being consummated, is of such tremendous importance. It is one of the arms of victory. But when we view the war as a whole, then we must at the same time realize that our nation has not yet drawn the full and fitting conclusions from it all. For in this common war for survival, the indestructibility of our friendship with the U.S.S.R. and victory itself will be assured *only* through common action—through common military action—through the fullest mutual collaboration on the part of the Soviet Union and ourselves.

To speak the essential truth, we have not yet completely left the domain of words—fair and honorable words, it is true, words of admiration, words that mark a thoroughgoing transformation in our way of thinking—to pass over onto the plane of action. Our nation has not yet attained those heights from which it may sweep away all Chamberlainism, all opposition, all obstacles, all wavering, to throw itself, along with Britain and the Soviet Union, into a decisive struggle for the annihilation of mankind's arch-enemy. Our nation must draw the practical conclusions from its own words. On the decisive question of the Second Front, there are still huge icebergs to be melted. The patriots of our land have enormous tasks ahead of them, and especially the working class, the class whose patriotism is historic, in this great struggle for human freedom in which we are engaged.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SECOND FRONT AND THE WINTER OF 1942-43

BY EUGENE DENNIS

"The present winter is worth an age if rightly employed."—Tom Paine.

THE second winter of fateful fighting on the Soviet-German front, the decisive front of the people's war for national liberation, is now approaching. The conditions have been created, especially by the epic struggle of the Red Army, for the anti-Hitler coalition to make this the last year of the Hitlerites.

Will this take place? Will Hitler be destroyed as speedily as objective conditions make possible? Will victory over Hitlerism, which was possible in 1942, finally be fought for by all the Allies and won early in 1943? Will the winter of 1942-43 witness effective coalition warfare, a concerted offensive of the United Nations against Hitler Germany which can smash the Nazis? Will the mighty resistance, the developing counter-attacks and the pending counter-offensive of the Soviet Union against the Nazi invaders be buttressed by an Anglo-American invasion of the continent from the West in the last quarter of 1942?

These questions are on the minds of everyone, friend and foe of fascism alike. These questions dominate the thoughts and outlook of every resolute anti-fascist, and haunt the Brown Shirts. Especially do they permeate the thinking of every American patriot, of every enemy of Hitler's Axis, who girds to make 1943, the fourth year of the war against the Hitlerites, the last year of the war, the year to rid the world of Nazi fascism.

Much time and many opportunities have been lost already. Deferred military action by the United States and Great Britain in Western Europe has cost the Allies greatly in men, matériel, strategic territory and political-military initiative. This has given the Nazis and their satellites unnecessary breathing space and advantages. It let the chances for victory over Hitler in 1942 slip by. Consequently this has accentuated the military dangers and jeopardized the national interests and safety of all the United Nations, and in the first place of England and America. For, despite the heavy blows which the Red Army has inflicted upon the Nazi war machine, the Nazi advances in the Don, Volga, and Caucasus regions during the summer and autumn fighting have multiplied manyfold the dangers to the Middle East, to England itself, as well as to the Americas.

Because of this, the realization is growing in the United States and Britain that to delay further the opening of the Western Front against Hitler Germany—the heart

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and core of the Axis—means to needlessly prolong the war; it means not only to handicap the glorious struggle of the U.S.S.R., but likewise it means to gamble with the very national existence of the British and American peoples and with the common fate of the United Nations.

This is why the mass movement for the Second Front now is national in scope and continues to develop and expand. This is why the C.I.O. and influential circles of the A. F. of L., why wider sections of labor—the backbone and driving force of the national war effort and of the strategy of the offensive—are intensifying their independent activity in support of the most rapid fulfilment of the Roosevelt-Churchill-Molotov agreement for creating a Second Front in Europe this year. This is why authoritative political spokesmen like Senators Pepper and Murray, Governors Olson and Van Wagoner, and Mayors Jackson and Bawron have identified themselves with the "public clamor" for the Second Front. This is why the statesmanlike and powerful pleas of Wendell Willkie for the immediate opening of the Second Front have struck such a deep popular response and are exerting a positive political influence.

And this is why the highly significant statements of government policy outlined by President Roosevelt on September 7 and October 12, and by Under-Secretary of State Welles on October 8, regarding developing a major offensive in Europe, have gladdened the hearts of all patriotic Americans, of all anti-Hitlerites. For these pronouncements reaffirmed our government's decision of June based on the "full understanding [which was] reached with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942." The declarations of the President and the Acting Secretary of State signalize that the orientation and preparations of the U.S.A. for striking at Hitler in the West have been and are being advanced. What is necessary now is that the government's decision to take the offensive against the Nazis be carried out fully, now. What is necessary now is that labor and the people develop still more energetically and widely their mass activity in support of our President's and government's policy for the offensive; that they work to implement it and to overcome the strong, retarding pressure and influence which the Munichites and the vacillators are still able to exercise against the unfoldment of governmental policy.

In the midst of the current discussions and evaluations now taking place in the United Nations on the Second Front has come Joseph Stalin's historic letter of October 4 to Mr. Cassidy of the Associated Press. This forthright estimate and declaration clarified the central issues, placed matters in their proper focus, have given a clear perspective and pointed the way to victory for all the United Nations.

As the great leader of the Soviet Union, as a great leader of the United Nations, Stalin re-emphasized the urgency and importance of the Second Front now for the entire anti-Hitler camp. And he placed the issue squarely. He made it clear that the creation of the Second

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Front is not the special concern and need of the U.S.S.R. alone, but is a matter of "first-rate importance" for all the Allies, particularly for our country and England, for attaining our common victory and for achieving this in the shortest possible time and with the least sacrifices. And this viewpoint is by no means limited to the Soviet leaders, as is indicated by the forthright statements of Willkie, Lieut. Gen. Stilwell, Pepper, Chaplin, Tanner and scores of other labor, civic, cultural and military leaders.

In respect to the question of aiding the Soviet Union, Stalin dealt with things as they are, put the issue on a firm foundation. He made it plain as to who is aiding whom. He confirmed what all the world can behold, namely that in terms of the incalculable and invaluable aid which the U.S.S.R. is rendering all the United Nations, by engaging single-handed 90 per cent of the Nazi war machine, that aid given to the Soviet Union "has so far been little effective."

And when Stalin suggested how to rectify this situation to the common advantage of the Allies, he undoubtedly referred to the problem of fulfilling *all* obligations fully and on time. This means, it would appear, not only nor so much the fulfilment of lend-lease commitments, but primarily and in the first place it means to honor and ensure the timely realization of the June 11 Pacts for creating a Second Front in Europe during 1942. For in this global war against Hitler's Axis, serious and effective aid to our Allies, which means in the first place aid to ourselves, requires above all common fighting action of *all* the Allies, of the entire coalition.

As the President emphasized on Sept. 7:

". . . The power of Germany must be broken on the battlefields of Europe. . . ." And further ". . . This war will finally be won by the coordination of all the armies, navies and air forces of all the United Nations operating in unison against our enemies. . . ."

On the decisive question of the Soviets' fighting capacity, Stalin pointedly stated:

"I think that the Soviet capacity of resisting the German brigands is in strength not less, if not greater, than the capacity of Fascist Germany or any other aggressive power to secure for itself world domination."

This evaluation of the fighting strength and war potential of the U.S.S.R. is of supreme importance to all the United Nations. This concise statement of Soviet power is of far-reaching significance and undoubtedly has many implications.

Among these it is necessary to note the following: Stalin's statement confirms the fact that during the course of the war for national liberation, notwithstanding temporary losses of territory and resources and despite untold sacrifices and heavy casualties, the relation of forces on the Soviet-German front has changed and is changing in favor of the U.S.S.R. and its Allies. And it is clear that the Soviet Union, now celebrating, in unison with all democratic peoples, its twenty-fifth anniversary, is growing stronger; its glorious Red Army,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successfully meeting the greatest military test in world history, is becoming more skillful and powerful; and its great and free peoples, united as never before around the Soviet Government and their leader Stalin, are performing new miracles in humanity's battle for national freeedom and democratic liberties.

The plain words of Stalin on the Soviets' capacity for resistance obviously contain a blunt warning to those fascist military circles in Japan who are harboring intentions of striking at the Siberian borders of the U.S.S.R. Likewise, this constitutes a warning to the Munichites and to those who are influenced by Munichism; this statement of fact once again calls to the attention of these gentlemen, and of everyone, that the Munichite plans for a negotiated "peace" with Hitler will come to naught, that Hitlerism will be utterly crushed and the Hitlerites annihilated.

But more than this, Stalin's statement on the strength of the Soviet Union is a reminder to certain gentlemen in the anti-Hitler camp, for instance to those for whom *The New York Times* frequently speaks. It serves notice that the cautious calculators are miscalculating when they count on delaying the opening of the Second Front until such time as, in their opinion, the Soviet Union might be weakened, until such time as the U.S.S.R. as well as Germany might be exhausted. Certainly, the cautious calculators, including many of those who now are advocating that the launching of the Western Front should be postponed until the "Spring of 1943," are greatly mistaken in their calculations of trying to weaken the U.S.S.R., of trying to limit its influence and role; more than this, these people are postponing and endangering victory for all the United Nations; they are jeopardizing the national interests and future of America and England, in the first place.

Finally, Stalin's modest and realistic judgment regarding the might of the Soviet Union, regarding its present and future fighting capacity, makes it crystal clear that an immediate Anglo-American offensive against Hitler from the West will find a Soviet counter-offensive under way against the Nazis in the East; that by developing common fighting action now, by opening the Second Front immediately, Hitler Germany can be speedily and decisively smashed.

Just as a year ago the United Nations were presented with an opportunity by *united military action* to rout and defeat the Hitlerites, so today another opportunity exists. The heroic, powerful and single-handed armed struggle of the Soviet Union against the Nazis has enabled the United States and Great Britain to muster great fighting strength and forces. The time has long since come to bring the united strength of the anti-Hitler forces into active and concerted operation, to strangle Hitler in Europe in a two-front war.

Labor and the people call for the offensive now. Will this be done in time? The President, as well as Willkie and Welles, have given an affirmative answer. Yet at this date, in mid-October, all is still quiet on the Western Front. There are still powerful forces in the U.S.A.—not to speak of in England—who are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blocking common fighting action of all the United Nations, who continue to pay lip service to the key to victory embodied in the American-Soviet-British pacts of June 11, who try to foment division among the United Nations.

For instance, in connection with Hitler's last speech at the end of September, the defeatists, as well as the hesitators and cautious calculators, again began to squirm; once more they come forward with their "wait-and-see" policy and in devious ways renew their public exploration of the possibility of establishing "peace" with Hitler's Axis—à la Vichy. Therefore it would not be amiss to examine Hitler's speech and the reaction of these gentlemen to it, as well as the objectives they pursue.

"Hitler is going over to the defensive"; "Hitler is killing himself with victories." Such in general essence was the tone of many British and American commentaries on Hitler's last speech. It is only to be hoped that the spirit manifested by these complacent "strategists" does not develop into a school of thought, one that would not be far removed from those who hold that an offensive in Egypt or that the important American military-naval action now taking place in the Solomon Islands constitutes a Second Front.

Otherwise, the United Nations may one day find themselves, to their astonishment, called upon to set aside a holiday by way of celebrating the "progress" which Hitler has made along this path of "killing himself with victories." Those gentlemen who, to their own deep gratification and in their smug self-satisfaction, have been able to get nothing more than this out of Hitler's speech may one day find that there are new and terrible surprises in store for them, of which we have had more than our share ever since the days of Munich.

Commentators of this sort naturally have not read Hitler's speech with the object of discovering from it, insofar as one can from one of the Fuehrer's tirades, *just what weaknesses it reveals.* They have read it merely to find in it fresh arguments for sabotaging the Second Front. After all, why attack Hitler, why run such "enormous risks as we did at Dieppe" when from Hitler's own words it is plain that all he wants is "to go over to the defensive"? Why not wait, wait and see once again, until we and England have from fifteen to twenty million soldiers, 200,000 tanks, and 150,000 airplanes?

Hitler, who has had sufficient opportunity to study the minds of his agents and dupes, of the Quislings and the capitulators, is displaying a canny foresight when he throws out the statement that all he wants to do this year is to "hold" the territory that he has conquered. He has seen them tremble at his speeches too often not to be aware that a certain kind of "opponent" will tremble still more at the thought of attacking him.

Hitler's speech, the truth of the matter is, through no volition of his own, reveals all the weaknesses of his position, and those leaders who are endowed with the initiative and courage may find in it ground for optimism and may be able to discern favorable chances for victory—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without in any manner underestimating the supreme gravity of the task. For this speech of Hitler's is, in part, reflective of his own enormous fear, that of his generals, and that of the German people: *a fear that the situation in which they found themselves last winter will be repeated, but this time under more unfavorable conditions, this time not only with the Soviet Union but also with England and ourselves taking advantage of it.*

Just as a man who has been close to death is always referring to his terrifying experience, so in this last speech of his we find Hitler coming back to the winter of 1941-42. In his own words he paints us a picture which shows us just how near to "cracking" Hitler Germany was:

". . . The year 1942 included many things. It was in my opinion the greatest, most fateful trial among the nations. It was the winter of 1941-42. I may say that the German people, and especially the army, was safeguarded by Providence during that winter.

"Worse things cannot and will not come any more. That we have conquered that winter, 'General Winter,' that in the end the German front lines were finally maintained, and that we could attack again this spring, that is to say, in the early summer—that, I believe, is proof that Providence was satisfied with the German people. . . ."

These words of Hitler's show all his and the German people's dismay in the face of the facts; facts that show just how near to going to pieces the German army was last winter; facts that throw considerable light on Hitler's concern for the approaching winter.

One might have thought that the British, with our assistance, in the months between January and March, 1942, would have taken advantage of the catastrophic plight of the Nazi army on the Eastern Front by launching a powerful offensive in the West. Hitler at that time was in a desperate situation. On the Eastern Front a demoralized and disorganized army which had suffered a frightful loss in men and matériel and which was hard beset by the attacking Red Army.

Perplexity and confusion reigned in the high command. The high command was only able to prevent the army from going to pieces entirely by bringing up all the available fresh divisions to relieve the shattered and demoralized detachments so that these could be sent to the rear. Among officers and soldiers alike a deep-seated depression reigned, bewilderment, and something akin to open panic which at times had to be put down by the S.S. detachments with bloody measures of repression.

In the event of an attack in the West, Hitler would have been compelled to divide his reserves. He would not have been strong enough to withstand an energetically conducted Western offensive, and would also have been largely unable to replace his battered divisions in the East with fresh troops. This would have made it possible for the Red Army in its turn to launch an ever-widening counter-offensive, and would in all likelihood have resulted at that time in a smashing and decisive defeat for the Hitlerites.

Had the British leaders and our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own displayed the same initiative, the same daring, the same breadth of view as the political and military leaders of the Soviet people, then today, in all probability, Hitler Germany would already be vanquished, and consequently the situation in the Far East would be entirely different.

But instead of taking advantage of this great historical opportunity, instead of taking this opportunity to shorten the war and thereby spare mankind countless sacrifices and sufferings, what happened? The British and ourselves at that time did not lift a finger in the West and thus gave Hitler a chance to get out of the dangerous situation he was in, and gave him a chance to reorganize his Eastern army. Under such conditions, the Red Army's epic offensive before Moscow and Rostov could then meet with only limited success, and the German High Command was "finally" able to "stabilize" its lines.

Hitler in his September speech says something about "Providence" having been on Germany's side. But this "Providence" lay rather in the fact that, as so often, his opponents in the West did not have the initiative and the daring to attack him at a time when he was but a few steps from defeat. Hitler himself makes clear the advantage he took of that situation:

". . . It was a very difficult and very hard test, the most bitter trial of all. Nevertheless, we overcame this most difficult period. Not only that, but in all calm we managed to put into order the attack divisions, the motorized troops, and to regroup respectively to form these divisions. These units were destined to initiate the further victories. . . ."

It is, indeed, unfortunately a fact, as Hitler says, that the British and ourselves "in all calm" permitted this highly favorable situation to slip through our fingers. Hitler's speech throws a fresh light on the tragic situation that existed in the West; the passivity, the inactivity in the name of unpreparedness, the dreadful speculation as to whether, perhaps, "the Germans and the Russians should not be left to finish one another off"—all of which saved Hitler in 1942.

And so now, Hitler is "going over to the defensive" and "merely means to hold the territory that he has conquered"! And yet certain Americans and Englishmen, like the gentlemen of *The New York Times*, are content to give the Russians inspired applause, but without so much as raising a finger to take advantage of the highly favorable circumstances that exist for launching immediately a United Nations' offensive against Hitler and annihilating him once and for all. These gentlemen are opposed to, or are out of step with, our government's policy. They are obstructing our nation's war effort and the common endeavors of the United Nations set forth in the June pacts. They are hampering the decisions and the march to victory affirmed by our Commander-in-Chief in his fireside message to the nation on October 12, when he stated:

". . . As I have said before, many major decisions of strategy have been made. One of them—on which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we have all agreed—relates to the necessity of diverting enemy forces from Russia and China to other theaters of war by new offensives against Germany and Japan. . . ."

* * *

Today, no doubt, the situation is not identical with that of last winter. The Nazi war machine has been further weakened, the Soviet Union has grown stronger. But even the situation at the present moment has strong points of resemblance to the other one. And in his speech Hitler shows that he is hoping that, just as happened the winter before, he will be able to extricate himself from a situation that is coming to a dangerous head. That is what he has in mind when he tells us that he means merely to "hold his gains." He says:

". . . For this year we have prepared for ourselves a very simple program. In the first place, under all circumstances, we must hold whatever must be held. That is to say, we must let the other attack as much as they wish wherever we have no intention to advance. We must hold everything and must wait to see who tires soonest. . . ."

For this year, that is to say for the winter months, Hitler ostensibly is projecting the "defensive" as the chief line of strategy in his war plans, while he prepares to break through to the Volga and to the Middle East, and hopes to be able to "stabilize" his Eastern Front so as to shift troops against England.

In what way does the present parallel last winter's situation? Just as last winter, Hitler has not yet achieved the military objective behind his offensive, despite the fact that his summer offensive was limited, was concentrated on one sector of the Southeastern Front. He has not been able to defeat the Red Army or to render it inactive and prevent it from counter-attacking and taking the counter-offensive. He is bogged down at Stalingrad, and his plans for the conquest of all South Russia and the Caucasus have not been realized. Moreover, since last winter he has suffered gigantic losses in men and matériel, and even as his limited offensive bogs down, a second winter is coming on and revolt spreads in the occupied countries. In addition, Hitler's Western Front is shaky and is defended only by a skeleton army. The United States and England have now acquired formidable military strength. They have accumulated great striking power in Britain, and have already attained air superiority in the West.

The major portion of Hitler's army and air force are in the East, facing an undefeated Red Army under the command of matchless leaders. Hitler now has need of a few months in which to try and reorganize his bested army, to try and provision and replenish it, in order to try and be ready next year for another great offensive, either in the West, the Middle East, or in the East. For this task, Hitler has need, as he did last year, of absolute quiet on the Western Front, so that once again he may reorganize his army "in all calm." And he is counting on the same inactivity, the same passivity, the same damaging influence of the Munichites which still hampers the unity of action of his opponents in the West, which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still impedes the victory policy of our President and nation. And by his bristling tirade, Hitler hopes to strike fear in our hearts.

For one who is really interested in fighting Hitlerism, Hitler's September speech is one more argument for a Second Front, and for the opening of that front this year, 1942. It shows us once more how the Do-Nothing-Heroes saved Hitler the winter before. It shows that an Anglo-American offensive now against Hitler in the West, together with a similar offensive on the part of the Red Army in the East, can speedily inflict a decisive defeat upon the Hitlerites, can rapidly destroy Hitlerism.

In his latest speech, Hitler also takes occasion to praise his allies, "above all, the Finns." The Quislings and pro-fascists are still succeeding in driving their unwilling peoples into battle, and with the aid of terror, Hitler has got the support of eighty Rumanian, Hungarian, Italian, Finnish, Slovak and other divisions. In this case, the Quisling leaders are willing, the peoples are unwilling, but the divisions are there, and are a big help to Hitler.

In our own case, the people are willing enough to fight Hitler; our Government is willing and has made its decision to invade Europe; but in place of action, of a coordinated war of the United Nations against Hitler, the defeatists and hesitators have so far succeeded in blocking the fulfillment of the June Pacts.

Hitler's speech calls for the only effective answer. Nazism must be knocked out on two gigantic European war-fronts before the winter is over. Our Government's decision to attack Hitler in the West must be implemented without delay. For today, more than ever, "deeds, not words alone, count." For now as never before the course of the war and its length depend on the immediate opening of the Second Front. Not one Ally fighting alone, but all the Allies fighting together—this is the way to insure and speed the defeat of Hitler's Axis.

In this crucial situation, as Comrade Browder has stressed, labor and the people, including the Communists, are now confronted with extraordinary responsibility of historic importance. The fate of our country, the cause of all the United Nations, demands that we display still greater political and organizing initiative, still greater boldness and resoluteness in strengthening the mass movement for the Second Front *now*. It demands that we increase and augment war production to the maximum. It demands that we promote and consolidate national unity and the unity of action of the United Nations, especially the alliance between our country and our valiant and strongest ally, the Soviet Union. It demands that the people insist more firmly than ever that all pro-fascists, obstructionists and incompetents be removed from all official posts and government agencies.

This is the guarantee for realizing and implementing the June Pacts before it is too late. This is the guarantee that this winter will mark the last winter for the Hitlerites. This is the guarantee for victory for America and all the United Nations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL UNITY FOR TOTAL WAR

BY TIM BUCK

Address Delivered at Toronto, October 13, 1942.

ON behalf of myself and all those anti-fascist Canadians who have recently gained freedom to participate in the struggle for victory, let me thank all those public-spirited men and women and organizations whose democratic pressure upon the government was such a powerful factor in bringing about our release.

We wanted to be free to take part publicly in the war effort. This month of October has become the most critical month of the war. In the whole course of this terrible struggle no days have been so decisive for mankind as the days that we are living through now. Our freedom as a people, our very survival as a nation, depend upon our ability to defeat Hitler in this the fourth year of the war. On behalf of all my associates I thank all Canadians who helped to make it possible for us to take an open and public part in this struggle.

A few weeks ago Vice President Wallace of the United States held up the ideal to all people, of making this century the century of the achievement of security and comfort for the great masses of the people We all welcomed the expression of such sentiments by a great representative of the American people. We know that after victory is won there will be opportunity for far-reaching democratic progress. The great mass of our people, not only Canadians but all the peoples joined in the United Nations Alliance, are determined that such democratic progress shall be achieved. We will not go back to the conditions of the 1930's. Canadians, along with the peoples of all the democratic nations, are determined to win this war precisely because we are determined to maintain the possibility for democratic progress in the peace, because we are determined to defeat all attempts to destroy our freedom as a nation.

It must be emphasized, however, that fierce battles must be fought before that ideal can be achieved. This century will be "the century of the common man" only if we succeed in preventing an Axis victory. *We must defeat the Axis!*—everything else depends upon that. We have only one chance. We shall get no second chance if we fail to defeat Hitler now. The Axis powers grant no freedom to the nations they conquer. The United Nations

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must win the war, or we lose everything.

It must be admitted that until now we are not winning the war. Our potential forces are tremendous —far greater than those of the Axis —but, until now, the Hitlerite Axis has consistently held the military advantage. The only way we can change this and put a stop to Nazi advances is to begin seriously to fight on the scale and in the manner that will match and surpass the scale and technique of the Nazi armies. Whether we have the qualities of victors or whether we shall be defeated without even having challenged our enemies' might, all this will be determined in the coming months and the people must make their voices heard in a determined demand for action that will bring victory.

The purpose of this meeting *is to give expression to the great public demand for the lifting of the ban on the Communist Party.*

The occupants of this platform demonstrate the breadth of that public demand. They illustrate the tremendous change that has taken place in the problems confronting the people of Canada, and the influence of those problems upon our political life. Remember, the issue of the legality of the Communist Party is part and parcel of the issue of National Unity to win the war. The public men and women who are demonstrating a courage which is all too rare in Canada today, by addressing this meeting, are not only fighting for the civil rights of Communists, they are pressing the fight for national unity for total war—and that, my friends, is the fight for Canada's national existence.

Since our release, I have been asked by scores of people: "What will you Communists do now that you are free?" Our answer to that question is simple: we are going to devote all our energy to helping to win the war.

Fighting against Hitler and all other brands of fascism is no new experience for us. Communists, not only in Canada but all over the world, have been fighting fascism consistently since it first emerged as a menace to democracy. We are proud of the fact that twelve hundred Canadian Communists went as volunteers to help the heroic people of Spain to defend their constitutionally elected republican government, and we treasure the memory and the names of nearly seven hundred Canadian Communists who laid down their lives in that struggle. They fought and died defending democracy in Spain, when that was the central and decisive issue in this long drawn-out struggle to determine whether democracy or fascism shall survive.

The central issue of the war today is the issue of the Second Front, in Western Europe. Premier Stalin, in his reply to an inquiry from the Associated Press correspondent, placed this issue of the opening of a Second Front in its proper place, as the central issue of the war. Stalin's forthright statement reflects the considered opinion of the most experienced and successful military leadership of the United Nations. Premier Churchill has informed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them of the men and materials at the disposal of the Allied powers, and they, on the basis of their experience in meeting and killing Nazis, declare that it is enough for an invasion of Europe. Stalin's reply reflected not only the proud confidence of the Soviet people in their ability to defend their homeland, but their justified and growing impatience—the impatience of a heroic, self-sacrificing people and their military and political leaders —at the slowness of their powerful Allies in getting into large-scale action in this historic hour. I declare without hesitation that in expressing that impatience Stalin spoke not only for the people of the U.S.S.R., but for the great mass of democratic people of all the United Nations.

The need for a Second Front has been acknowledged by all the United Nations governments. It was emphasized by the Roosevelt-Churchill-Molotov agreement last June, upon the urgent task of establishing a Second Front in Europe in 1942. Two months ago, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, a member of the inner war cabinet, assured the people of Britain that the next eighty days would be decisive; that if the Russians could hold on for a few weeks the gathering forces of the greatest alliance the world has ever seen would give us the first evidence of victory. Mr. Wendell Willkie has urged the immediate opening of a Second Front. Mr. Sumner Welles, United States Under Secretary of State, spoke last Friday in favor of the creation of a new theatre of operations against Hitler. Premier Churchill said yesterday that "the Allies have reached a stern and sombre moment." President Roosevelt announced yesterday that new offensives will be started against Germany and Japan.

Yes, many assurances have been given and all these assurances are good. But the people are becoming impatient with assurances. They realize that the opening of a Second Front is necessary for the safety of Britain, of Canada, of the United States, and assurances of our growing superiority are no substitute for action. They see vast accumulations of weapons and equipment and millions of soldiers idle, and their minds become filled with doubt and scepticism.

The people know that the sinister interests which brought about the betrayal at Munich are still powerful. In Canada people see the representatives of the Vichy Government operating freely with the protection of diplomatic status. They know that the Vichy Government is an instrument of Hitler's and they suspect that appeasement forces and Munich tendencies are playing a big part in delaying a Second Front.

This has got to be changed. The only way to defeat Hitler is to fight, and for Canada to fight with all her strength, all appeasers and the agents of Vichy and their friends must be thrust aside.

The decisive military problem of the United Nations today is to take the initiative away from Hitler; to bring our tremendous mobilized forces into action; to come to grips with Hitler's armies on the scale and in the manner which would en-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gage all his forces and strain his resources to the breaking point. To kill Nazis. To smash Nazi military formations. To arouse, inspire and arm the fighting millions in Europe. To fight, fight, with everything we've got, until the Nazi military machine cracks and the soldiers of the United Nations march into Berlin. That is the task. The time to start it is now. The pecple of the United Nations cannot afford *not* to open a Second Front. The exact place and time are military matters but the question of whether or not to strike is a question for all the people. This is a war not only of governments but of entire peoples. The future of humanity is being decided and the people in their millions must make their voices heard and insist upon the strategy that will bring victory. In this, the fourth year of the war, we can preserve the possibility of crushing Hitler's armies between mighty offensives of the Red Army from the East and the Allied Armies from the West only if we invade Europe now.

To make Canada's contribution to a Second Front fully effective we need National Unity. The future of all Canadians is at stake. Canadians of French, English and other origins, workers, farmers, professional and other middle-class people, and, yes, capitalists, of all religious faiths and political opinions, must join hands in an all-out effort to keep our country free.

National Unity is growing. The platform of this meeting is evidence of that. The speakers and the chairman on this platform represent the great majority of political opinions in Ontario, and Canada, and Mr. Tanner represents the wartime unity of the overwhelming majority of the people of the British Isles.

The immediate purpose that brings us here is to demand the lifting of the ban on the Communist Party. But the driving force which unites us in that demand is the growing realization that Canadians of all classes and creeds must unite in defense of our country and our way of life. I regret extremely that the Canadian Commonwealth Federation did not join in the effort to make this meeting representative of all political opinions, the more so because the national leadership of the C.C.F. participated in the effort to secure our release, and I am confident that the majority of both leaders and membership of the C.C.F. agree with the need for National Unity to win the war.

For their efforts to develop the Canadian unity which is now so vital to victory, I want to thank the Premier, Mr. Hepburn. I want to thank Mr. Macauley and I want to thank Mr. Drummond Wren. What they are doing is only incidentally for me and the Communist Party; it is above all for Canada and for victory. For his efforts in the cause of unity of the United Nations, not only here but in the A. F. of L. Convention, I want to thank our brother Jack Tanner, secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union of Britain.

The trade union movement in all the United Nations has demonstrated its will to help establish National Unity and its will to subordinate its immediate interests to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

winning of the war. One of the most inspiring sections of the splendid address delivered by Jack Tanner to the A. F. of L. Convention was that part in which he described the efforts by which the workers of Britain defied Hitler's bombers and stepped up war production in the midst of the blitz to unprecedented levels—levels which are still going up.

Canadian trade unionists are also stepping up production. Day by day now production records are being established. At Vancouver shipyard one worker drove 2,048 rivets in eight hours. This record was still being marveled at when a French-Canadian worker set out to beat it and succeeded in driving 2,100 rivets in eight hours: 262 rivets every hour of the day. In airplane production, tank production, gun and small arms production, the same things are being done. *The trade unionists of Canada are in this fight to win.*

Canadian workers are ardently supporting the efforts to bring about unity of the two great trade union centers in North America. We know that a united labor movement will be a more effective force in the struggle for National Unity, and we know that trade union unity in North America will strengthen the trend toward unity with the workers of Latin America, Britain and the U.S.S.R. We join our voices to the voice of Jack Tanner in declaring that we are proud to be associated in the struggle for freedom with the heroic trade unionists of the U.S.S.R. We salute the workers of Coventry, of London, of Bristol and other cities in the Old Country who are contributing so much to the struggle for victory. We salute the workers of Stalingrad, Moscow, Leningrad, Rostov, Odessa and dozens of other Soviet cities. The workers who labor with rifle or machine-gun beside their machines and when necessary quit their machines temporarily to help expel the invaders. Theirs is the highest expression of a people's war for national freedom, and Canadian workers join voices to the voice of Jack Tanner in declaring that they would be proud to join with the trade unionists of Britain and the U.S.S.R. in fraternal international cooperation.

I know I speak for the Left wing of the labor movement when I urge all trade unionists, the C.C.F., the Social Credit movement and all labor and farmer progressives to join hands in the struggle for total war unity.

There is no room in Canada's national life today for narrow partisanship or special interests. *There is no room in our country today for any issue except the issue of winning the war.* To win the war we must have National Unity at home and international unity in the United Nations Alliance.

National Unity requires that all political parties and spokesmen recognize that the nation's war effort must be heeded by the Dominion Government of the day, and it requires of the Dominion Government that it pursue policies of a truly national, total war character. The people of Canada will support such policies. They have given

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wholehearted support to every step taken by the King Government toward such policies. It must be admitted, however, that the policies of the King Government are not as yet the policies needed for National Unity and total war.

The gravest weaknesses in the policies of the King Government are directly traceable to the influence of interests which oppose National Unity for Total War. These interests are the main umbrella under which the agents of Vichy continue to operate in Canada, and these interests are still represented in the cabinet, by opponents of National Unity whose names are associated with the forces that are opposing total war.

That is not the worst. The Prime Minister allows his name to be used in anti-conscription propaganda. Only last Friday Premier Godbout of Quebec, who is the leader of the King Liberals in that province, assured the Liberal Women's Association in Quebec City that: "you will not have conscription so long as you have King at the head of the government."

Such statements from a man with Premier Godbout's relationship to Mackenzie King are contrary to the national interests of Canada. They are an affront to the growing total war forces in the Province of Quebec and they are bound to fill the minds of Canadians all over the country with misgivings as to Mackenzie King's willingness to lead a total war effort. It would be a fatal blow to the morale of our people if the idea should become current that Premier King is simply clinging to power as long as compulsion for overseas service can be avoided with the intention of resigning when it becomes unavoidable.

Canadians cannot allow equivocation on this question, because we know that a selective draft for overseas service will become unavoidable. We can't beat Hitler with one hand tied behind our back. Canada has to go at him with everything we've got. We shall not be able to do that without a selective draft for overseas service. The people of Canada are accepting the burdens of the war; our sons are going gladly to fight in defense of our land and the freedom we cherish, and we demand of Mr. King that his Government shall stand pledged to back up those boys with everything that Canada has! Mr. King must repudiate the suggestion that was implicit in the statement of Premier Godbout, and Mr. King must clear the remaining elements of Munichism out of his Government.

We Communists have supported the war efforts of the King Government. We have condemned all efforts to exploit the weaknesses of the Government—its hesitation, its concessions to the champions of limited participation—for narrow partisan advantage. We have emphasized the fact that the general direction of King's policies has been forward—slowly, with many sidesteps and attempts to evade issues, but gradually forward—toward total war, and we have emphasized proudly the big contribution that Canada has made and is making to the military strength of the United Nations. We shall continue to do

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these things. We are offering our services in the present victory loan campaign.

We welcome Mr. King's advocacy of labor-management cooperation in his address to the A. F. of L. Convention, and we shall continue to do everything in our power to make labor-management cooperation an increasing factor in the stepping up of war production. We welcome the appointment of Major General LaFleche to the cabinet. It is a step in the right direction because it gives some slight recognition to the strong and growing total war forces in Quebec, which until now have been literally ignored by the Government. But the appointment of General LaFleche does not make the King Government a total war government. The people of Canada want a war government which is based upon and representative of that great majority of Canadians who realize that *what matters now is winning the war!* We Communists shall continue to press for such a government, regardless of Party labels or special interests, because we are convinced that Canada must have a government that will thrust aside every consideration of sectional interest. Canada's government must subordinate everything to winning the war.

Such are the policies that we are fighting for. They can be summed up under the following heads:

a. Strengthen the Dominion Government, not by an artificial coalition of party leaders desirous of sharing the spoils, but by making it truly representative of the total war forces in the country.

b. Place the government squarely on record, pledged to back up the boys overseas, with everything that Canada has, including the selective draft for overseas service.

c. Make every machine produce to the limit of its capacity, twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week. Keep the boys overseas supplied with an endless stream of the finest weapons that science and skill can produce. Strengthen the government's support of the struggle to increase production by making the establishment of labor-management production councils mandatory. Democratize the government's war labor policy by enforcing the union's right to collective bargaining.

d. Build up the armed forces; back up the boys who fought at Dieppe, and make sure that their dependents are adequately provided for. Support the government's victory loan campaign and all measures to strengthen the war effort by civilian activities.

e. Build National Unity for total war at home, and international unity within the United Nations for cooperation to insure victory over Hitler today and for United Nations' collaboration to establish a firm and lasting peace when victory has been won.

f. Make this the century of the common man by defeating Hitler. Invade Europe immediately and establish a Second Front. Join our forces in a mighty combined offensive with the Red Army and grind Hitler's armies to pieces in the jaws of a two-front war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

g. A political offensive in Quebec to win French Canada for National Unity and total war. Launch a political offensive in Quebec to show the ardent Canadians of French Canada the reasons why this is their war as much as it is the war of all other Canadians. Show them that their language rights, their religious freedom, their political rights and their provincial autonomy are at stake. If the Axis powers are allowed to win the war, all the rights that the French Canadian people have won by generations of struggle will be swept away. We will press the Godbout Government of Quebec to enact legislation to correct the evils of inadequate education and social legislation from which the French Canadian people suffer, and we will press the Dominion Government to make it possible for French Canadian boys to join French Canadian units, officered by French Canadians with commands in their own language.

It is a simple program. Every plank in it grows directly out of the interests and needs of Canada. Our future and our children's future depend upon whether the people of Canada succeed in carrying the main features of such a program through. If you agree with that program, and I think that most of you do, you will join in the fight for National Unity in carrying it through. If you are for National Unity for Total War you will join in the fight to lift the ban on the Communist Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MINERS' CONVENTION

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

I

THE most dramatic action of the United Mine Workers convention was the decision to disaffiliate from the C.I.O. Only if we bear in mind the significance of this act, the causes that led to it and the objectives that John L. Lewis hopes to achieve thereby, shall we be able fully to appreciate all the other acts and decisions of this convention. We shall also be able to see beneath the demagogic phrases through which Lewis hopes to conceal from the miners, the labor movement, and the whole country, his true position on the war and all questions affecting the prosecution of the war.

There can be no question about the fact that the 500,000 members of the U.M.W.A. are loyal Americans supporting the war effort and the policies of President Roosevelt. The miners who, rich in a tradition of militancy, have played such a vital role in all of labor's struggles in the past and in the great advance of the working class, in the organization of the unorganized through the formation and growth of the C.I.O., are today no less devoted to the principles and policies of the C.I.O. than before. And yet the Cincinnati convention of the U.M.W.A. was anything but a win-the-war convention. Its main orientation was anti-Roosevelt. It attempted to set up new obstacles to labor's unification — essential to winning the war. How such a situation was made possible we must fully fix in our minds, if we wish to know what is to be done to block John L. Lewis's plan to weaken the war effort, disrupt the labor movement, and strengthen the forces of reaction in the country.

The very fact that Lewis was compelled to conceal from the miners his true position on the war and most other questions is proof that the miners are ready and willing to do all in their power to win the war. This necessity on the part of Lewis to maneuver and hide his true position also shows the possibility of defeating him, once his position is unmasked and the miners are given leadership which will inspire them with the necessary confidence that they can overcome the strong and vicious Lewis machine.

It is by no mere accident that Lewis chose as the first act of the convention the disaffiliation from the C.I.O. To be sure, this act, which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took place on the second day of the convention, was preceded by Lewis's defensive plea on the opening day that he was being slandered by those who charged him with having a position opposed to the war. But this could not conceal the fact that it was the attitude toward the war that was the main difference between Lewis and the C.I.O. leadership, and that the act of disaffiliation set the stage for all other decisions taken subsequently.

Lewis tried hard to make it appear that the U.M.W.A. disaffiliation from the C.I.O. was a result of a conspiracy against him personally and against the U.M.W.A. on the part of the C.I.O. leadership. He gave purely technical and organizational reasons for this step. He charged the C.I.O. leadership with failure to pay its "debts" to the U.M.W.A. He charged that the C.I.O. was interfering with the organizational campaigns of the U.M.W.A.-District 50, that it failed to give the miners full support in their wage dispute with the captive mine operaters, that it refused to work for A.F. of L.-C.I.O. unity. But the very fact that Lewis was compelled to spend so much time in defending himself as a supporter of the war was evidence enough that it was this issue that was the real cause for the difference between him and the C.I.O. leadership. And this also explains why Lewis, having been decisively defeated and isolated within the C.I.O., now decides to leave the C.I.O. and carry on a fight against it from the outside.

John L. Lewis could find no arguments to defend his position on the war. All he could do was to prove that the miners are patriotic Americans, something which no one ever doubted. He pointed to the fact that more than 60,000 miners are in the armed services of the United States, that the miners bought 40 million dollars' worth of war bonds, that they contributed one million dollars to the war relief agencies. He could point to no acts on his part or that of the official leadership of the U.M.W.A. in support of the President's policies. And he remained silent on his associations with the America First outfit or on his infamous statement jointly with fourteen other America First Republicans headed by Hoover, Landon and Dawes, condemning the British-Soviet alliance after Hitler's invasion of the U.S.S.R., condemning American lend-lease aid to the U.S.S.R., and charging that the "Anglo-Russian alliance has dissipated that illusion" of this being "a world conflict between tyranny and freedom."

Not with one word did Lewis repudiate this position. Not with one word did he disassociate himself from the appeasers and defeatists. And for only one reason—that this is still his true position, despite the fact that he is now compelled, like the Hoovers and Lindberghs, to pay lip service to the war, while doing nothing to help win it, while doing plenty to hinder it and only waiting for the opportune moment to join Hoover in his negotiated-peace-with-Hitler plans.

Here was the U.M.W.A. conven-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion meeting at one of the most critical moments in the history of the world and of our country, at a time when all our people are watching with the greatest anxiety and hope the Battle of Stalingrad, that epic struggle the like of which the world has never known and upon the outcome of which so much depends—and yet Lewis remains silent. The workers of our country and the people generally are pleading for the immediate opening of the Second Front. But Lewis says not a word. Why? Because, like all appeasers and defeatists, he is opposed to the Second Front. And why not? After all, to Lewis this is not a struggle between freedom and tyranny. International labor solidarity? Lewis, like Hutcheson, will have nothing to do with the Soviet trade unions. But even Lewis, knowing the true feelings of the miners, did not dare to oppose the convention going on record in favor of "aid to Russia, Britain and China."

The powerful U.M.W.A., had it followed the policies of the C.I.O. instead of the defeatist policies of Lewis, could have given a tremendous impetus to the whole of the war effort. Had the convention given true expression to the inner feelings and desires of the miners it would have taken the lead in the fight for the opening of the Second Front, for the strengthening of the United Nations and the alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union. It would have become a powerful force for all-inclusive cooperation of the labor movements of all the United Nations. It would have shown the way toward the solution of the many problems of war economy—increased production, the proper distribution and best utilization of manpower, it would have strengthened the fight against inflation, promoted the development of labor-management committees. It could have been a great force in the promotion of labor and national unity and for a struggle against all defeatist and appeaser elements who are sniping at the Roosevelt Administration and hindering the development of the offensive on the battle front and the all-out mobilization of the country for the war effort.

But it was the heavy hand of Lewis and his henchmen that prevented the miners from playing this role. Instead, the convention decided to isolate the miners from the rest of the labor movement. It engaged in sniping at the President. It gave encouragement to the most reactionary forces in the A. F. of L., headed by Hutcheson and Woll, to try to prevent the unification of the trade union movement. It gave encouragement to all the appeaser forces in the country in their effort to block the victory of the United Nations' struggle against the Axis.

This does not mean of course that the delegates to the U.M.W.A. convention knew that in supporting Lewis they were voting for these objectives of Lewis. The very fact that Lewis could not openly unfold his whole and true position tended to cloud before the miners the true meaning of the action they took on some of the most vital is-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sues, such as the disaffiliation from the C.I.O. Lewis could not and did not attack the war and pleaded his support. Many of the decisions of the convention such as aid to the Soviet Union, Britain and China, for the abolition of the poll tax, for the extension of the work week to six days as demanded by Secretary Ickes, opposition to the outrageous tax bill before Congress, the decision to postpone the demand for readjustment of wages to the time of the expiration of the agreement in April, among others, are good decisions and were made possible only by the fact that they expressed the overwhelming support of the rank and file of the miners, and even Lewis could not oppose them without completely exposing himself. On the other hand, the failure of the convention to condemn the Biddle decision on Harry Bridges, the postponement of freedom for the Indian people until after the war can in no sense be said to express the attitude of the mass of the miners. And certainly the convention's approval of Lewis's policy of opposition to granting autonomy to the nineteen U.M.W.A. Districts now under receivership by Lewis was in direct opposition not only to the membership of these districts that comprise the majority of the U.M.W.A. membership, but also to the great majority of the miners in all the other districts.

II

How was it that Lewis was able so to distort and defy the true will of the U.M.W.A. membership? There is no doubt that the convention itself, one of the largest in the history of the U.M.W.A., was composed of a considerable number of hand-picked delegates, selected with the aid of intimidation on the part of the Lewis machine in the various districts and locals, who did not represent the wishes of their locals. It is also true, as is reported by some who were present at the convention, that the Lewis machine was able to intimidate many delegates, who came with mandates from their membership, to ignore their membership and support Lewis. The Lewis machine has had much experience in overriding the will of the membership and in "organizing" conventions. This cause for what happened at the convention should by no means be minimized. And yet it can not and does not offer a full explanation for what happened, for the ability of Lewis to dominate as he did the convention of more than 2,000 delegates. There were other reasons as well.

One of the most important of these reasons lies in the fact that the position of Lewis on the war is not fully clear to great sections of the miners. They did not agree with him or follow him when prior to the 1940 elections he praised Hoover and then through the Hoover connections came out in support of the Republican ticket. They did not agree with him and did not support him when he joined with the America Firsters. They did not agree with him when he joined with Hoover and Landon in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slandering the Soviet Union and in denying that the war against Hitler was a war against tyranny. But they do not yet see that, despite his lip service to the war after Pearl Harbor, he has not changed his former position. Let us suppose for one moment that Lewis would openly come out against the war. Is there any doubt that he would be repudiated by the miners and that he would never be able to face a convention of the U.M.W.A.? But since Lewis, like Hoover and the other America Firsters, conceals his true position, many miners, even though they had always opposed his isolationist position, do not see in him as yet an enemy of our country's war effort. They believe that he, like many others, was wrong before Pearl Harbor, but today is a loyal supporter of the war. *To expose the true position of Lewis on the war remains therefore the most important and most fundamental task. To unmask him before the miners is a condition for isolating and defeating him among the miners just as he was isolated and defeated in the C.I.O. as a whole.*

The fact that the miners, separated from the rest of the workers by the very nature of their place of work and their living in the mining towns, were unable to learn Lewis's true position helped Lewis to conceal his position. They did not learn his true position from the U.M.W.A. Journal, of course, and they had no recourse to other labor literature. Lewis had always seen to it that the C.I.O. News, for example, should never go to the miners. Only through the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* as well as through some of the foreign language progressive press did a small section of the miners get the full truth regarding Lewis's position and role. *One of the chief lessons from this is the necessity on the part of the C.I.O. unions in other industries to take special measures to reach the miners personally and with literature. Now more than ever, when the U.M.W.A. has disaffiliated from the C.I.O., is it necessary for the other C.I.O. unions and their membership to display the greatest solidarity toward the miners and develop all forms of united action with them.* This situation also emphasizes the necessity greatly to increase the number of readers of the *Worker* among the miners.

Another reason for the ability of the Lewis machine to control the convention and retain a strong influence among the miners, lies in the fact that the miners have made substantial gains in the last years in the growth of membership and in the improvement of their conditions. The ability of the U.M.W.A. in the past period to abolish the Southern wage differential and to win the closed shop in the captive mines—victories of the greatest importance—has no doubt contributed to the authority and influence of Lewis among the miners. Lewis tried to make the convention believe that he had won these gains despite the refusal of the C.I.O. leadership to support him. But the truth is that all the gains of the miners since 1933 were made not because of the "cleverness" or the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"connections" of Lewis, but only because of the support that the miners received from the whole labor movement, especially the unions affiliated to the C.I.O.; because the miners in the main had the support of a friendly attitude on the part of the President; and because of the readiness of the miners themselves to fight for their unions and for improved conditions. If it is true that the C.I.O. has benefited from the support of the miners—and it is absolutely true—and that the whole labor movement will never forget the support of the miners, it is equally true that the miners have benefited greatly from the struggles and the support of the workers in the other industries.

And only the continued solidarity of the miners, steel workers, auto workers, the workers in all of the C.I.O. unions and the entire labor movement can help maintain the gains of the miners and win for them new gains. This of course is also true for all other workers. And this is why the Lewis decision to disaffiliate from the C.I.O. and his attempts to hinder the unification of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. must be resisted by the miners no less than by the workers in all unions.

Still another reason for the ability of Lewis to control the convention lies in the fact that the miners wish to maintain the unity of their organization, at all costs. The miners still remember the time when their organization was disrupted. They still remember the time when they had no uniform national agreements, when they were compelled to work under open shop conditions, or under separate district agreements in various parts of the country. Even those who are wise to Lewis gave him their support because they fear that Lewis would not stop at again disrupting the organization unless he had his way. The miners, perhaps more than the workers in any other industry, have learned from experience that they are powerless by themselves in each mine or locality, that only a strong national union can defend their interests.

One of the most important reasons that the miners, who are behind President Roosevelt and his war policies, still in large numbers support Lewis is the fact that the miners do not yet sufficiently realize the relationship between their economic position, the economic struggles and the broader political issues in general and the war in particular. The miners do not yet sufficiently realize, for example, that with Lewis's policies and methods they can not at present, under the conditions of war, maintain their economic gains. They do not yet fully understand that the development of a planned centralized war economy in general and its corresponding forms in the mines is essential to the whole country's war effort and to the well-being of the miners. That the struggle for maximum production of coal, the control of prices, democratic rationing, control of rents, etc., are all essential to the miners no less than to the whole labor movement and the entire country, and that Lewis's position on the war and his consequent attitude on these vital ques-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions represent the greatest threat to the economic standards of the miners.

And, finally, Lewis was able to control the convention, carry through his attack on the C.I.O. and its leadership headed by President Murray, because there was no leadership at the convention to give expression to the will of the miners, to inspire them with confidence in the ability to meet and defeat Lewis. The whole policy of Lewis has been one of discouraging the development of leadership among the miners. No new leaders have been able to come forward. The undemocratic character of the organization has made it difficult for new leaders to arise, except perhaps local leaders. And even local leaders were discouraged. Unless such local leaders agreed to become "yes" men for Lewis they were politically beheaded and often also found themselves jobless. But the miners who opposed Lewis expected that those leaders identified with President Murray, who was most undemocratically removed by Lewis as Vice President of the U.M.W.A., would lead the fight against Lewis at this convention. The failure of many of these old leaders of the miners to make the fight, either by not attending the convention or by failing to make the fight at the convention even when they were present, could not but discourage the miners who came to the convention to make the fight.

The fact is that the miners' locals sent in hundreds of resolutions of a progressive character, resolutions calling for a Second Front now, for international labor unity, the maintenance of relations with the C.I.O., and other issues. There were 96 resolutions demanding District autonomy. It is well known that a large portion of the delegates voted contrary to the instructions they received by their locals. Had the convention been provided with some leadership, the results on many vital questions would have been altogether different from what Lewis had planned.

In this connection it must also be emphasized that the Left forces among the miners, including the Communists, also failed to register their full influence at the U.M.W.A. convention itself as well as in the election of delegates to the convention. Had they been able to do this, the convention would have registered greater opposition on the autonomy issue, on the question of disaffiliation from the C.I.O., as well as on other issues. This situation clearly calls for much improved work by the Communists in the mining communities, a greater effort to increase the readers of the *Worker*, the sale of our literature and the recruiting of miners into the ranks of the Party.

III

What will be Lewis's course now after the U.M.W.A. convention? First, he will attempt to use the increased powers he put over for himself in the convention for the purpose of putting down any opposition to his policies. He will attempt to wipe out the last vestiges

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of democracy within the U.M.W.A. and to rob the miners of any leadership opposed even mildly to his domination. Already the convention decided to "investigate" the head of District 5—Pat Fagan—undoubtedly for the purpose of removing him. Lewis has already laid the basis for the expulsion of all miners identified in any way with the C.I.O., including C.I.O. President Murray.

Secondly, he will try to use the decisions of the convention extending the jurisdiction of the U.M.W.A.-District 50 and the increased dues for the purpose of launching organization in new fields in direct conflict with the C.I.O. unions and in many cases, as for example in the construction field, also with the established A. F. of L. unions. He will not stop at raiding existing unions. He will, as he hinted at the convention of District 50, attempt to bring into his fold the so-called "independent" unions headed by Mathew Smith and the existing company unions. Thus he will try to establish a so-called "third labor center" for the purpose either of fighting both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. or, if possible, of using it as a bargaining center with the Hutcheson-Woll wing of the A. F. of L., with the object of entering the A. F. of L. as a means of preventing the unity of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. and for strengthening the reactionary tendencies in the A. F. of L. as represented by Hutcheson and Woll. There is some real hope that he will not succeed in this maneuver and that the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. will move closer together in the coming period as a result of their joint activity and the resumption of the scheduled unity negotiations. Both the C.I.O. and the more responsible A.F. of L. leaders headed by Green have a great responsibility in this respect.

Thirdly, it can be expected that Lewis, while paying lip service to the war, will continue his anti-Roosevelt policies, hindering the war effort by attempting to place obstacles in the way of increased production, by trying to utilize every difficulty, every necessary adjustment to the war, as a basis of sharpening the relations of labor and the government. He is already making use of Trotskyites, Norman Thomas "Socialists," as well as Coughlinites and K.K.K. elements who, under the false cover of "defending the workers' interests," are doing all in their power to undermine the nation's war effort and disrupt national unity.

Fourth, he will lend his support to the reactionaries and appeasers in both of the major parties, the Hoovers and the Wheelers, with whom he is now associated, giving them support in the elections and in Congress for the purpose of undermining and weakening President Roosevelt's influence in the Democratic Party and Willkie's influence in the Republican Party. Lewis's strong effort to organize the farmers is not due merely to a desire to extend the strength of the U.M.W.A. organizationally. He has in mind, together with the Hoovers and Wheelers, the prevention of national unity behind the President in the war effort, the prevention of a United Nations' victory over

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Axis and a people's peace. His demagogic attempts to win the support of the Negro people by posing as their champion must also be seen in this light. This places the greatest responsibility upon the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. in their work to win the Negro people, by fighting for equal opportunity for the Negro people in production, in the life of the unions and generally to win for the Negro people full equality in every phase of the economic, political, social and military life of our nation.

Thus it is clear that for the miners, for the whole labor movement and for the entire country, the position of Lewis represents a most serious threat. It must not be minimized or ignored. It must be met and defeated. And the Lewis threat to the labor movement, to the war effort, to national unity, can be defeated only by the miners in cooperation with the rest of the labor movement. The complete isolation and defeat of Lewis will not be an easy job and will not be accomplished in a day. But it is a task that must be undertaken without delay and carried forward with tenacity and persistence, until it is accomplished. In general what is to be done is already indicated by the above analysis as to the causes of Lewis's ability to maintain influence over the miners and the objectives that Lewis will try to achieve in the coming period.

In addition, however, the Left and progressive forces among the miners must understand that through agitation and propaganda alone they will not be able to break the hold of Lewis among the miners or overcome all of the causes that made possible Lewis's domination of the U.M.W.A. convention. This will be accomplished above all *through the development of those policies and activities which will bring the largest number of miners into direct participation in the war effort.* In this connection, first and foremost, is the development of the program for planned and increased coal production, the development of the joint labor-management committees, the development of and support for all measures that will insure the maintenance of real wages of the miners through rent and price control, democratic rationing, etc. The prolongation of the work-week by itself, unaccompanied by planned production, will not be an answer to the problems that the miners face both as citizens wishing to contribute all in their power to the country's effort, or to maintain living standards essential to maximum production and the morale of the miners. With more than 60,000 miners at present in the armed services, with 75,000 miners already having left the mines for other war industries, the need for such a plan is evident. And it is precisely on these issues that the miners will be able to see the dangerous role that Lewis is playing in the hour of our country's greatest need and also the bankruptcy of the Lewis policy as far as defending the miners' economic standards is concerned with the old "trade union as usual" methods.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the same time, the miners through their local unions individually and by regions, by themselves and jointly with other labor and people's groups must be stimulated to express and actively demonstrate their support for the war, for the policies of the President, for the Second Front, for the strengthening of the United Nations and of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. alliance, through the organization of war relief activities on behalf of the fighting peoples of the Soviet Union, China, Great Britain and the other United Nations. In this connection the existing people's organizations in the mining communities, such as the fraternal organizations, furnish the means through which the miners, their families, and other peoples in the community can carry forward many of the war activities.

The miners should resist every effffort toward isolating them from the rest of the labor movement. Continuing their fraternal relations with the C.I.O. unions, improving their relations with the A. F. of L. workers, the miners can become a force not only to defeat Lewis's attempts to prevent labor unity, but to promote this unity. Especially should the miners make common cause with all other workers as well as other patriotic groups in the election campaigns, in the convening of legislative conferences for the purpose of influencing the state legislatures and Congress.

At the same time, the miners should resist every effort to rob them of their democratic rights. They should strive to make their great union, for whose unity they must fight, a real democratic organization. They can find ways and means to register their opposition to Lewis in the coming U.M.W.A. elections, despite the fact that for most offices there are no opponents to the Lewis candidates. The miners should resist attempts to remove regularly elected officials, such as are being undertaken by Lewis in District 5. They should express their opposition to any move for the expulsion of those loyal members of the U.M.W.A. who are performing a great service to the miners as well as to the rest of the labor movement by their leading position in the C.I.O. and its affiliated organizations. Where the conditions are favorable, the miners should register their opposition to the harmful actions of the convention, especially the disaffiliation from the C.I.O. Lewis and the delegates received no mandate from the miners for this step. A referendum on this issue, if Lewis dared take it, would show that the majority of the miners would vote to remain within the C.I.O.

The labor movement as a whole also has great responsibilities in helping the miners in the struggle against Lewis. First, the labor movement must bear in mind that Lewis and the great U.M.W.A. with its half million members are not identical. The miners should not be held responsible for the deeds of Lewis. The labor movement must extend a helping hand in a spirit of solidarity to the miners in all their work. The miners must be aided in every way in their adjustment to the war economy, and their eco-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic standards defended by the whole labor movement.

The labor movement—both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L.—can make the greatest contribution to the defeat of the Lewis policies by expanding the unity of action between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. and by moving more rapidly toward organic unity. The repudiation of the anti-unity, pro-Hoover and anti-United Nations policies of the Hutchesons and Wolls within the A. F. of L. will at the same time be a blow against Lewis. By overcoming all jurisdictional struggles within the A. F. of L. and between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., by a united labor movement undertaking the organization of new millions among the unorganized, the disruptive plans of Lewis and his flirtations with the company unions, all of which represents a threat to the entire labor movement, can be quickly and decisively defeated. In any event, the C.I.O. unions should plan and organize anew the broadest campaign to organize the millions of workers now being brought into industry. They can bring millions of new members into the C.I.O., provided they understand how to approach the new workers in industry and take special measures to make it possible to draw in the millions of women and Negro workers who are needed and are available as one of the main factors in the democratic solution of the acute manpower problem.

Finally, the Communist organizations, not only in the mining areas, but generally, face a great responsibility. The Party has the task of helping the entire labor movement understand the significance of this whole question and its responsibilities in relation to it. At the same time, if the Communist organizations in the mining communities work in the spirit of our party's policy—Everything to Win the War—if they understand how to face the problems concretely and boldly, if they help clarify the issues among the miners with the aid of the *Worker*, Party pamphlets, and especially the great contribution of Comrade Browder through his latest book, *Victory — And After*, they can perform a great service to the miners, to the labor movement and to our country. Recent experiences of our Party in the mining areas show that on the basis of such work our Party can play an important role in reaching and influencing the miners, who are anti-fascist to the core, and who can and must play a more vital part in the nation's victory drive. To accomplish this most effectively, our Party must strengthen its ranks and its work through the recruitment of miners, so that a stronger Party can be of even greater service in this all important task. We have a special contribution to make to win the miners to a fuller and more active participation in the war effort, for the Second Front, for labor unity. This task, which requires the unmasking of Lewis and defeating his policies, is a task, not only for the Communists, but for all labor, for all progressives, for all democratic Americans working for victory over Hitlerism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRENDS IN THE A. F. OF L.

BY ROSE WORTIS

I

THE main purpose of this article is to show what is happening within the various organizations of the A. F. of L., the trends that are developing within the A. F. of L. as a result of the whole impact of the war and the changed composition and growth of the A. F. of L. It is important to see how the membership of the A. F. of L. is reacting on the most vital issues before our country and the labor movement on such essential win-the-war issues as the Second Front, international labor cooperation and the unification of our trade union movement. It is necessary to draw lessons from the important changes and developments within the A. F. of L. for the purpose of strengthening those trends that make for labor's full and more active role in the war effort. It is also our objective to show how the Left and progressive forces in the A. F. of L. today can play an important role in helping to determine the course of the A. F. of L., once they fully understand what is happening in it, and boldly to take up their responsibilities.

It is impossible, however, not to mention and deal at least with the highlights of the Toronto convention of the A. F. of L. which has just come to a close. We have as yet not had the opportunity to evaluate fully the work of the convention, to examine all the reports and resolutions, or to profit by a collective discussion on the results of the convention. Therefore, these remarks on the A. F. of L. convention perforce must be only of a fragmentary and preliminary character. But even such a view of the Toronto convention, we feel, will contribute to a better understanding of what is happening in the A. F. of L. and will help emphasize some of the issues and problems confronting the organization. At the same time we feel that only by bearing in mind the basic developments within the A. F. of L. as developed in the latter part of this article can a full appreciation of both the positive and negative features of the convention be obtained and a one-sided view avoided.

In viewing the positive side of the convention, the win-the-war character of many of the speeches and decisions, we would be making a mistake if we underestimated the meaning of the failure of the convention to break the stranglehold of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Hutchesons and Wolls on such an important question as international labor unity, as well as the failure of the convention, in the face of the crucial stage of the war, to come out in support of the immediate opening of the Second Front. But, also, it would be a serious mistake not to take note of the many important contributions of the convention to the war effort and not to see beneath the surface the forces that are striving for dominance in the A. F. of L.

No single characterization of the convention can adequately describe its decisions. It was neither wholly reactionary nor wholly progressive. It cannot be said to be a model win-the-war convention; yet it cannot be denied that many of its decisions will greatly contribute toward winning the war. The convention did not reflect the wishes and desires of the millions of the A. F. of L. membership, and yet in many instances, and in a number of decisions, this will was partially reflected, even though too often incompletely and in a distorted form.

* * *

The 500 delegates to the convention, representing close to five and a half million dues-paying members, were composed almost exclusively of top officials of the various national and international unions, presidents, secretaries and vice presidents. No workers at the bench and only a handful of lower officials were there. The great changes in the A. F. of L., the shift to more basic and war production industries, were not as yet reflected either in the delegations or in the control of the convention which remained largely in the hands of the Hutchesons and Wolls. Such important unions as the machinists with 400,000 members, the painters, hotel and restaurant workers, the I.L.G.W.U., the electrical workers and others, where the mass of the membership is more and more showing a progressive trend and helping to influence the course of the leadership, are not given the role in the organization and leadership of the convention to which they are entitled by their membership.

While the Hutcheson-Woll clique is united, bold and determined and is thus able to exert an influence on the convention far beyond its actual strength, the pro-Roosevelt supporters, who include the majority of the A. F. of L. unions and leaders, remained unorganized and divided. The fact that such leaders as Tobin of the teamsters—the most powerful of the A. F. of L. unions —and Dubinsky, head of the large I.L.G.W.U, joined with or capitulated to the anti-Soviet Hutcheson-Woll clique in opposing unity with the Soviet trade unions in international labor cooperation, gave a powerful weapon to this clique which it did not fail to utilize for purposes of control of the convention on other issues.

President Green, partially because he represents no union of his own and because of the failure of the other pro-Roosevelt forces to stand together, not only retreated before the Hutcheson-Woll clique, but often, as was the case in his reply to the British delegate, Jack Tanner, who urged the Second Front and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the formation of the Anglo-American-Soviet Trade Union Committee, became their tool.

But despite this condition within the convention, despite the fact that the convention stubbornly refused to establish international trade union cooperation and to come out for the Second Front, the Hutcheson-Woll clique did not succeed in blocking the convention from supporting many of the policies of the President, nor preventing the further development of united action between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.

As one of its first acts, the Toronto convention, through the speech of President Green, gave its full approval to the efforts of President Roosevelt to stabilize and control prices, to extend rationing as a means of strengthening the war effort and block inflation. It came out in full support of the War Labor Board. Without necessarily agreeing with every phase of the resolution or the motives of some of its supporters, it must be said that the convention's decision in support of the centralization of war production, procurement and rationing is an important step forward by the A. F. of L. The action of the convention in support of the Geyer-Pepper anti-poll tax bill under a special order of business for the purpose of influencing the vote in Congress is of great significance.

One of the most important developments at the convention appears to be the fact that the attempts of the Hutcheson forces to bring Lewis into the A. F. of L., and thus torpedo the coming unity negotiations between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., received a serious setback. While this danger has not completely disappeared, from the speeches of President Green, and especially his direct remarks in answer to Lewis and in his speech following his reelection in which he spoke hopefully of the success of the unity negotiations, it would appear that the conditions exist for decisively defeating the Hutcheson-Lewis maneuver.

The sharp criticism of President Brown of the machinists of the policies and intrigues of Hutcheson, the abstention of the majority of delegates from voting on the jurisdictional dispute between the machinists and the carpenters, as well as the critical remarks of President Tobin against those who called for amendments to the Wagner Act on the ground that it is being administered in the direction of aiding industrial unions and the C.I.O., show that there are sharp differences within the A. F. of L. Council and that important changes are maturing.

The response of the convention to the speeches of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, and Assistant Secretary of War Patterson, both of whom paid glorious tribute to the Soviet Union and the Red Army, the fact that both William Green and Meany have joined with others as sponsors for the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as well as the impressions created by the speeches of the British delegates, can be used now after the convention as a basis for greatly strengthening the movement for interna-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional labor unity, for the strengthening of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. alliance, for developing the United Nations' offensive. The speeches of President Green on the Second Front, despite their limitations, also can be used effectively to further the movement for the Second Front in the A. F. of L. unions.

The decisions of the A. F. of L. convention on trade union unity, the statements of President Green that both the rank and file of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. desire unity and cooperation, the call for an "armistice" in jurisdictional conflicts, help furnish the basis for immediately strengthening the joint activities of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. and for the mobilization of the A. F. of L. membership to assure that the Hutcheson-Lewis attempts to block unity will be defeated.

All the decisions of the A. F. of L. convention in support of the President's economic program, decisions basically in line with the policies of the C.I.O., furnish the basis for the A. F. of L. organizations everywhere to intensify their efforts toward increased war production, for the development of joint labor-management committees, for the struggle against inflation, for full participation of labor in all government, economic, production, labor and rationing boards, and for the speedy solution of the pressing manpower problem in a democratic and effective manner.

The failure of the A. F. of L. convention, as a result of the influence of certain reactionary and business-as-usual forces, to deal adequately with the problems of the Negro workers and the women workers, only emphasizes the necessity for the various international unions, the local organizations and city and state bodies of the A. F. of L. to give the most immediate attention to these and the other vital win-the-war problems.

In general, the convention emphasizes the urgency for the Left and progressive forces in the A. F. of L. to come boldly forward with proposals called for by the war and already supported by the membership, and through the organized effort of the workers to strengthen those forces and trends in the A. F. of L. that are moving in a progressive, in an anti-fascist direction and to isolate and defeat the defeatists and reactionaries.

II

The present war is effecting basic changes in the life of the American people. As the war situation becomes more acute, the role of the people is felt more and more as they develop greater initiative in attempting to influence the basic strategy of the war.

The most far-reaching developments are seen among the workers, especially the organized labor movement, including the A. F. of L. The trade unions are emerging as the most conscious and most advanced section of the population, taking upon themselves ever greater responsibilities in providing the means for the more effective conduct and prosecution of the war.

This new sense of responsibility,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the tremendous tasks labor has set for itself, is effecting changes, not only in the relationship between labor and other sections of the population and government, but also in fundamental changes in labor's approach toward some of its own problems, such as the organization of the unorganized, trade union forms, methods, structure and organization, as well as the approach toward new sections of the working class, Negroes, women workers, youth, the Second Front, labor unity, international cooperation, independent political action, etc.

To the extent that organized labor fully appreciates its new responsibility, it manifests growth and more widespread influence in the life of the nation.

New Trends

The membership figures released by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. show a growth in one year of close to a million new members, raising the membership to almost six million, the highest in its entire history.

This phenomenal growth in membership both of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. shows a new development in the American labor movement, in contrast with the last war. In 1917-18 the leadership of the A. F. of L. agreed to a "status quo" position for the duration of the war. The labor leaders affixed their signatures to a policy that no "combination of workmen shall undertake during the war period to 'close' an 'open' shop," and that "the continuance of such conditions shall not be deemed a grievance."

This agreement prevented organization of the unorganized and gave the employers an opportunity to build up company unions which they later used to smash the trade unions. In the present war the changed relations of forces, labor's new position in the life of the nation, its stake in the war, its initiative in advancing production and the entire war effort of the nation, make it possible for labor to protect the basic conditions of the workers, to intensify its organizing activities, its growth and consolidation, despite the fact that it voluntarily gave up its right to strike. In contrast to the wave of "outlaw" strikes in 1917-18, we now witness a growing spirit of cooperation between labor and management, dramatized in the movement of Labor-Management Production Committees.

These new developments stem from the people's character of the present war and the role of labor as the most advanced anti-fascist section of the people.

The character of the industries now being organized by the A. F. of L., their role in production and the composition of the new workers recruited is of great significance.

The new recruits in the A. F. of L., in the main, come from the basic war production industries—Metal Trades, Shipyard, Aircraft—in contrast with the past, when the bulk of the A. F. of L. members were skilled workers. Secretary Meany's report to the A. F. of L. convention records an increase of 107,000 in the Machinists' Union. The Boilermakers more than doubled their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

membership, from 42,000 to 90,000. While the Federal local unions increased their membership by 250,000.

This turn from craft to basic war production industries, stimulated by the achievements of the C.I.O. and the expanding war economy, resulted in a change in the composition of the A. F. of L. membership. It is breaking down the bars against women workers and Negroes. It is forcing unions to put aside apprenticeship restrictions against young workers. The Boilermakers Union, one of the oldest of the craft unions, through a referendum vote decided to admit women workers to union membership on an equal basis with the men workers, by a two-thirds majority. About 5,000 women already are employed at welding and other lighter work in shipbuilding, and thousands more are to be hired.

Local 727, International Association of Machinists, Seattle, admitted Negroes to full membership. Local 727, International Association of Machinists, Burbank, California, initiated some 300 Negroes employed in Lockheed Aircraft.

In the West Coast Kaiser plant, under a closed-shop agreement, the refusal of the union to admit Negro workers to membership has precipitated a crisis. Through the intervention of the Manpower Commission, the Negro workers won the right to work at skilled jobs, over the objection of reactionary leaders of the union. The very urgency of the war and the demand for manpower is forcing many unions to change their attitude and to abandon their discriminatory practices, or to endanger war production and their closed-shop contracts.

The changing attitude toward Negro workers was reflected in a statement by President Green on the eve of the convention. In commenting on the refusal of the Boilermakers Union to admit Negroes into the Kaiser plant, he stated: "I will insist that locals practicing discrimination will be ordered by the parent organization to act as an American organization." Similar statements have been made by other leaders.

Another indication of this new trend is the adoption of an anti-poll tax resolution and the introduction of anti-discrimination resolutions at the national convention.

This indicates a new attitude in the approach of A. F. of L. leaders who until now evaded the issue by contending that admission of Negro workers is a matter to be decided by individual autonomous unions.

The Federation's War Effort

The infusion of new blood from the new workers in the basic war-production industries is having its effect on the general policies and activities of the A. F. of L., especially in its lower bodies, whose leaders are in closer contact with the rank and file. This is seen in the contribution of the A. F. of L. workers in the national war production effort. Thousands of A. F. of L. workers in war industries, like the workers of the C.I.O., have distinguished themselves by admirable production records. Here are a few instances:

The performance record in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

production of Liberty ships is headed by the Oregon Shipbuilding Corp.—A. F. of L. Metal Trades.

The California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, California, holds second position for the number of ships produced—A. F. of L. members.

The Richmond Shipyard, Richmond, California, holds second place in total number of ships built—A. F. of L. members.

Boeing Aircraft factory—Seattle—received the Army's production flag—Local 751, I.A.M.

A. F. of L. workers by the thousands have raised their voices in support of a concerted military offensive against Hitler Germany, in support of the President's agreement with Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov on the urgency of opening a Second Front in 1942, for labor unity, and international cooperation with the labor movements of Great Britain and the U.S.S.R.

Throughout the entire country, numerous local unions, central bodies and local officials have not only spoken out in general support of the war but have recognized their responsibility in influencing the major line of war strategy. Despite the propaganda of the defeatists to leave all matters to the military "experts," these leading bodies and officers, representing a cross-section of the organized A. F. of L. workers, spoke up. Here are but a few examples representing a cross-section of the country:

Amalgamated Butcher Workmen, Local 623; San Francisco Machinists Lodge, Local 68; Masters, Mates and Pilots'Ass'n,. Local 90; San Francisco Culinary Workers, Local 110; Aero Mechanics Lodge, San Diego, Cal., Local 1125; Food and Candy Workers, Local 20120; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Local 96; Musicians, Los Angeles, Local 47; International Ass'n of Machinists, Local 79; Carpenters and Joiners, Local 1408; Bookbinders, Local 4; Screen Cartoonists Guild, Local 852; Firemen and Oilers, Local 63; Cooks Local 209; International Jewelry Workers, Local 23; International Ass'n of Machinists, Local 758; International Ass'n of Machinists, Local 727; Typographical Union No. 6; Painters District Council No. 9, New York, New York State Culinary Alliance, Hotel and Restaurant Union—Joint Board, San Diego (California) Trades and Labor Council, Seattle Federation of Labor, San Mateo (California) County Central Labor Council, Jamestown (N. Y.) Central Trades Council, Joint Board Culinary Alliance, Maryland State Federation of Labor, Washington State Federation of Labor, Painters State Federation, N. Y.

Northwest A. F. of L. Leaders Sign Plea for Second Front

At the Illinois State Convention, 40 delegates introduced Second Front resolutions. In Wisconsin fifty. In Seattle forty A. F. of L. leaders issued a public statement to the same effect.

Of special significance were the State A. F. of L. conventions. Thirty-eight State conventions took place during the summer months. The open defeatist forces, led by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hutcheson, did not dare to show their hand among these loyal and patriotic delegates representing millions of organized Americans. The war was the dominant issue at these conventions. Full support was given to the President's domestic policies. Some advanced steps were taken in recognizing the importance of organizing the women workers. Many of these conventions spoke up boldly against Negro discrimination, against the fifth columnists, for unity and support to our allies, the Soviet Union, Britain and China.

Still another group of conventions, such as Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Washington, swayed by the argument of leaving the Second Front to military specialists, expressed their readiness to increase production and make all necessary sacrifices in support of offensive action when the military authorities are ready to launch an offensive. These conventions, too, adopted resolutions on international labor unity.

The most important state conventions, such as Ohio, New York, Connecticut and New Jersey, where the Left-progressive forces are more consolidated, also adopted resolutions calling for the opening of a Second Front in Europe.

The Left-progressive forces played a decisive role. The character of these conventions and their decisions depended to a large degree on the strength, organization and initiative of the Left-progressive forces. Wherever real decisive leadership was given, the mass of the delegates responded with the greatest enthusiasm.

Problems of Leadership

These new developments are gradually beginning to reflect themselves in changes in the leadership, the emergence of new elements from the ranks of the workers. This is especially true in the local unions where hundreds of young militant, progressive leaders are coming forward. These changes are also affecting the attitudes of some of the older leaders, like Tom Lyons, President of the New York State Federation of Labor; Murphy, of Newark; Higgins, Secretary of the Connecticut Federation; Beck, of the West Coast teamsters, and numbers of other union officials.

In some instances, where the old-line, reactionary, business-as-usual elements refused to follow the course of progress, they were swept aside and replaced by younger, more aggressive leaders, as in the Ohio State Federation of Labor where the old reactionary machine was voted out of office and replaced by a new leadership. We witnessed the same developments in the central bodies, in Baltimore and Los Angeles. Of course, the process of change is much slower in the central bodies.

An outstanding example of a central leadership that is not representative and is out of harmony with union developments is the New York City Central Trades and Labor Council. The executive committee and officers of that body come from the most insignificant unions. Murtha, its president, comes from the Stage Hands representing a small local of a few hundred mem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers. The largest unions, such as needle, food, printing, have no representation. Such a situation cannot logically continue much longer as the trade union movement begins to assume greater responsibilities.

III

Labor Unity

Since America's entry into the war, we have seen a growing unity of action, policies and program between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. The abortive "unity" conspiracy of Lewis and Hutcheson, which was devised to turn the labor movement from its course of winning the war, was defeated mainly through the alertness of the leadership and membership of the C.I.O. The recent action of Lewis in withdrawing from the C.I.O., the talk in the A. F. of L. lobbies and in the press about Lewis coming back to the A. F. of L. bring into the open the original purpose of the Lewis-Hutcheson "unity" scheme. It was intended, in the main, to open the door to Lewis to reenter the A. F. of L. and strengthen the defeatist forces within that organization. We hope that the win-the-war forces will not be tempted to gain an "advantage" over the C.I.O. by the readmission of Lewis. Such a move on their part would only strain relations with the C.I.O., endangering and possibly wrecking the new unity negotiations before they have even begun.

Until the A. F. of L. convention, it was generally assumed that the unity negotiations, which were to begin in the near future, would take place in a friendly atmosphere. At the New York State Federation of Labor Convention, Secretary Meany, in speaking of unity, said: "Our committee will enter the conference room without any prior commitments, without any qualifications, in a sincere desire for genuine organic unity. We of the American Federation of Labor mean just one thing —one solidified, united labor movement in America."

Since the unfortunate incident during the miners' wage dispute before the War Mediation Board last November when the A. F. of L. representatives broke with the C.I.O. and precipitated a crisis, there is full harmony between labor's representatives on all issues before the Board as well as all other government agencies.

Both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., though after some delay on part of the latter, endorsed and fought for the President's seven-point program. Both agreed on the President's anti-inflation program, price control, rationing, taxation and the creation of the National Economy Board.

As a result of this common action, labor was able to defeat the anti-labor measures, such as wage freezing and the establishment of the open shop.

These anti-labor measures, sponsored by the defeatists, were discredited and rejected in Congress through public pressure stimulated by the organized labor movement. Recent legislation in Congress makes

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secure collective bargaining, the Walsh-Healy Act, etc. Through united action, labor won the support of the public for its just demands. The Little Steel award, giving the workers a 15 per cent wage increase to make up for the increase in the cost of living, is a ruling now generally accepted as a guide by the WLB. This is also true of the "union maintenance clause."

Joint A. F. of L.-C. I. O. action helped establish the WPB under the leadership of Donald Nelson. The current changes in the war production set-up promise greater labor representation on the production boards. Labor-management committees are the direct results of united labor action. Through these committees labor will have a better chance to make its contribution toward all-out production and a better planned and centralized war economy. The appointment of John Green, president of the Shipbuilders Union of the C.I.O., and Fenton, general organizer of the A. F. of L., to the super-Production Board, are steps which point in the right direction.

There are still many unsolved, aggravating problems, such as the need for adjustment of wages for lower-paid workers and more adequate allocation of contracts to provide jobs for the thousands of unemployed, etc. The prospects for the speedy solution of these problems are brighter only because labor stands united.

Jurisdictional disputes have practically been eliminated, despite the fact that both trade union centers have intensified their activities in organizing the unorganized workers.

The basic issue, which brought division into the ranks of labor, namely, industrial form of organization, is being eliminated by life itself, despite the rantings of the Hutchesons. The A. F. of L. has come to recognize—even if only *de facto*—industrial unionism and the C.I.O. as realities.

The agreements of the top leadership of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. consummated in the establishment of the Labor Victory Board have helped to stimulate united labor action throughout the country. Labor Victory Committees have been organized in many cities. Joint Victory Rallies are taking place in many localities and there are even agreements to recognize each other's membership books. In Ohio, for instance, the opening of the A. F. of L. State Convention was greeted by a joint A. F. of L.-C.I.O. parade.

Thus we see general agreement by the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. in support of the war and ever-growing unity on a program of action for labor. In face of these basic agreements, unity is not only desirable but becomes a possibility. The urgent need for unity in the present crisis cannot be overemphasized.

The millions of new workers who are being drawn into industry today come from various sections of the people: some with a middle-class background, others from the rural communities, often dominated by reactionary anti-labor forces.

Among these are large sections of women, former housewives, Negro workers and youth. Government re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ports show that there are already 1,750,000 women in industry today. The plan is to increase their number to 6,000,000 next year. This new section of the proletariat has no trade-union background and many prejudices have been systematically cultivated among them by the reactionary press, which often gives them a Pegler version of the labor movement.

Continued division in the labor movement and competition for these new workers feed these prejudices and cause confusion among them. The open-shoppers are not slow in exploiting these backward tendencies among these new workers.

There are already danger signals in the revival of company unions. It is no accident that just at this time the so-called independent unions, which in reality are company unions, organized a national conference and are planning a convention to set up a "new center." This is a new effort of the diehard employers, who have never reconciled themselves to collective bargaining with their employees. They are now trying to dress up the old defunct bosses' contraptions as "independent" unions, and to use them to undermine the conditions of the workers and prevent further organization. There are already indications that John L. Lewis is flirting with this so-called "independent" movement.

These open-shoppers also have a long-range perspective. They are fondly looking back to the post-war period of 1917 when, through their union-smashing, open-shop offensive, they almost destroyed the labor movement. Approaching all problems of present-day life in their business-as-usual manner, they see the outcome of the war in the light of 1917 and are trying to gear their company unions to repeat the history of 1917. Labor must see to it that this shall never happen again. The guarantee that they will never return is a united labor movement.

A united labor movement could make greater utilization of the experiences in mass organization and more easily develop new methods of organizing the large numbers of women workers, Negroes and young workers; integrate them more rapidly into the life and leadership of the unions and build a labor movement powerful enough to act as guardian of the interests of the workers while serving the common cause of the nation. A united labor movement will create the necessary conditions for labor to emerge as an independent political force, contributing its full share to victory and to reconstruction and collective security after the war.

IV

As an integral part of unity in the ranks of labor, national unity and unity with our Allies is the question of international solidarity and collaboration of the trade unions for the prosecution of the war to victory and for a people's peace. The fraternal delegates from the British Trade Union Congress came to the convention to make a fervent plea to the A. F. of L. to put aside its past prejudices and join the British

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade unions and the unions of the Soviet Union to build an unbreakable chain of unity among the toiling masses of the United Nations.

In eloquent speeches Delegate Jack Tanner and others spoke of the heroic, self-sacrificing spirit of the organized workers of the Soviet Union, who on the home front and in the Red Army are giving their last ounce of energy—their very lives—for the common cause of all mankind.

Tanner told the delegates of the experience of the British trade union movement in its relationship with the Soviet trade unions, who under conditions of a socialist society are functioning as free democratic unions.

"We are proud to be associated with that brave people through our trade union organization," Tanner went on. "And if we are told that the character and spirit of their trade unions is different from that of the British trade unions, I can only reply that the character and spirit of the Soviet trade unionists in the fight against Hitlerism is also somewhat different from what our own has been to date.

"To say that the trade unions in the U.S.S.R. are nothing but appendages of the state machinery is to leave out of account the nature of the state and whose interests its activities foster and serve. In our two countries we cannot pretend that it is the workers' interests which will triumph in any issue, unless we put up a strong and organized fight.

"It is only by realizing the full weight of that fact—the ownership of the means of production by the workers—that we can understand the relations of the trade union movement to the Soviet state. Might I say that one of the objectives of any union is the control of industry in the interests of the community.

"Now it is perfectly certain that this type of struggle, in which the trade unions of Britain play a leading part, has had no place in the Soviet war effort. There has been no time and effort wasted in having to reconcile the conflicts between private and national interests; there have been no practices which hinder output, and as was demonstrated by the moving of great industries to new areas behind the Urals, as also by the heroic scorched-earth policy, nothing has stood in the way of the Soviet war effort for which every man and woman feels 100 per cent responsible.

"A beginning has already been made to bring about Allied labor unity and I fervently hope and would strongly urge that the greatest efforts be made to join together the workers of Britain, Russia, the United States — The A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods —the workers of Latin America, Canada and others of the United Nations in firm solidarity and practical unity.

"Let us remember that the principal aim of Goebbels and his gang is to split the allies, and particularly the working people of our countries. The attainment of Allied labor unity will be a serious defeat for Hitler."

Tanner's speech struck a responsive chord. It certainly expressed the widespread urge for unity of the rank and file, which will go forward irrespective of the action of the convention.

Friendship between the American

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade union movement and the Soviet unions and people dates back to the period of the revolutionary movement against tsarism. Friendship with the people of Russia is a tradition of long standing—temporarily interrupted—especially since Hitler came to power and started his world-wide anti-Bolshevik campaign aimed at dividing the advanced democratic nations of the world.

One need but quote from the official records of the A. F. of L. to show what hope and enthusiasm the establishment of Soviet Power aroused among the organized workers of America. In November, 1917, when the Soviet Government came to power, President Gompers, in speaking of Russia, said as follows:

"Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor."*

Now, when the lies, the slanders, the calumnies against the Soviet Union, its people, its government and its institutions have been swept aside, now when the entire civilized world amidst blood and fire can see the Soviet Union, its leaders, its people, its Red Army, as the advance guard in the struggle for national freedom and liberty, it is high time that the American Federation of Labor put aside its past prejudices, resume its past ties with the Soviet people, extend the hand of friendship and solidarity in the interests of our common cause, in the interests of mankind, in the interests of destroying Hitlerism.

The proposal of the Executive Council for a joint A. F. of L.-British Committee and liaison relations with the Soviet trade unions has been rejected by the Soviet trade unions. It was considered inadequate by the British trade union congress, and was protested by the C.I.O. It was also indignantly rejected by the Railroad Brotherhoods.

Both the latter organizations called for the full cooperation of all sections of the American labor movement with the British-Soviet Trade Union Council. Not only these organizations, outside of the A. F. of L., but large sections of the A. F. of L. itself considered the proposal of the Executive Council inadequate and called for the

* Samuel Gompers, *American Labor and the War*, p. 344.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reopening of negotiations and full cooperation.

Hundreds of local unions adopted resolutions and sent messages to the Executive Council urging such a course. More than a dozen of the most important State Federations and a number of International Unions which met in the recent period, such as the Building Service, Teachers, Jewelry Workers, the Pennsylvania, Ohio and Connecticut State Federations, etc., took similar action. At the New York State Convention, the resolution for international cooperation with the Soviet Union was endorsed by 225 of the most outstanding leaders, like Thomas Hickey of the Teamsters, Hanson of the Carpenters, Kirkman of the Electrical Workers, Duffy of the Hotel Trades Council, etc. Similar resolutions were adopted at the N. Y. State painters and culinary conventions. Several resolutions on international unity were also introduced at the recent A. F. of L. convention by the Wisconsin and Connecticut State Federations and by the International Jewelry Workers.

The opposition to international labor unity at the May Council meeting came from the defeatists led by Hutcheson who oppose everything that can help win the war, Matthew Woll and the diehard social-democrats such as Dubinsky. The latter are poisoned by their narrow partisan considerations and unfounded fears that relations with the Soviet Union may endanger their position as trade union leaders.

They do not realize that in opposing labor unity they are following in the footsteps of the Municheers who are ready to sell our country to Hitler for fear of the Soviet Union. Such policies give grist to the mill of the defeatists and the Fifth Column, who play on outmoded fears and prejudices against the Soviet Union, and try to prepare the ground for a negotiated "peace" with Hitler. There is a widespread gulf between the members and leaders of these unions with regard to the Soviet Union and even sharp differences among the leaders themselves, some of whom are beginning to appreciate the historic role of the Soviet Union and are abandoning their anti-Soviet position.

Another source of opposition came from some Catholic circles. Here, too, differentiations are developing, not only between the Christian Fronters, the defeatists and the pro-war camp, but within the pro-war camp, in relation to the Soviet Union. Important sections of Catholic workers and leaders and even sections of the clergy are re-evaluating their attitude toward the Soviet Union.

Of great importance is the statement of Cardinal Hinsley, as expressed in his interview with Quentin Reynolds, printed in Collier's on September 26, 1942:

"Those magnificent Russian people—they are willing to fight to death to defend their country from the scourge of the invader. Should we not show the same courage? I get impatient with Catholics who still look askance at our Russian brothers. Instead, we too should take an example from them. We should fight by them, side by side

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against our common enemy. The Russians do not understand us or our religion; perhaps, if we gave them 100 per cent help and gave them 100 per cent faith, they would understand us and our religion better. A Catholic in America who would not give aid to Russia is not true to his faith. . . .

"Think of this war as a mighty game. It can only be won by all team members, having perfect confidence in one another and with each willing to help the others to the utmost. This is how I feel about our Russian teammates."

The same sentiments were expressed in the speech of William Grogan, leader of the Transport Workers' Union, at the recent Union Square Second Front Rally, sponsored by the Communist Party.

Surely, these developments are influencing large sections of Catholic trade unionists and their attitude toward the Soviet Union and are bringing new supporters to the cause of international trade union cooperation.

A referendum vote on this question would, without any doubt, win the support of the overwhelming majority of the A. F. of L. members. What must be undertaken at the present time, and without any delay, is an effective struggle to unmask and expose the defeatists who obstruct international unity as part of their general opposition to the people's war against Hitler's Axis.

Conclusion

The major task before the A. F. of L. workers, as before all other Americans, is the speediest realization of the Second Front. The people of Stalingrad are fighting heroically. Their heroism has no precedent. It proves that where there is a will to fight—there is a way. All the military "experts" (whose conclusions are never to be questioned) declared Stalingrad lost weeks ago, as they did Moscow and Leningrad. Again their predictions are proven incorrect. The people of Stalingrad are fighting *now* harder than ever. So must the members of the A. F. of L. and all workers.

The developments in the A. F. of L. placed special responsibility on the Communists. Red-baiting, a byword in the past, is, with few exceptions, no longer indulged in. Wherever the poison of Red-baiting was raised at recent conventions by the defeatists, it was promptly recognized as an effort of the fascist enemy or his dupes to sow dissension and disunity and was rejected.

This is a beginning of a recognition of the loyal and steadfast role of the Communists in the A. F. of L. and the American labor movement. Our task is to help speed up the progressive developments, help make the A. F. of L. more effective in our national war effort, to help strengthen the unions among the unorganized, to help strengthen the movement for trade union unity, for international labor unity, for a Second Front Now and for Victory. In doing this we must make every effort to develop closest collaboration with other elements and forces traveling in the same direction.

In this connection we make clear to the masses that we Communists are not out for control; we do not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

want to dominate unions as the Red-baiters charge against us by misrepresentation. All we want is the same rights enjoyed by other workers. The right to work in the trade unions, to make our contribution toward the nation's war effort, including the building of a more powerful trade union movement. American labor is moving forward to its rightful place. Old, outdated formulas and maneuvers on top by defeatists will not hold back its progress. Its future and the future of all Americans are indissolubly linked up with the winning of the war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EARL BROWDER CHARTS THE COURSE TO VICTORY

BY A. LANDY

1. The Problem of Victory

VICTORY—AND AFTER is the first systematic and comprehensive presentation of the viewpoint of the Communist Party of the United States on the problems of the war and the conditions of victory. It is a *basic* book inasmuch as it is a thoroughly reasoned application of Marxist-Leninist principle to the analysis of the problems presented by the war. It is a *popular* book cast in a concentrated, disciplined style, free from pretense, unencumbered by phrases, with responsibility permeating its clear, incisive thinking and a superb irony and satiric wit lending wings to its expression. Coming at this decisive moment in the fixing of our nation's course, when frank facing of realities is our most vital need, Earl Browder's book will be of incalculable service to the cause of national unity and victory. In this respect, one cannot help recalling the great influence which such individual books have exerted in the past at decisive moments and critical turning points in the history of our nation.

The central theme of Browder's book is victory, the question on which clarity is most essential among the United Nations. It is the signal contribution of this volume that it clarifies this question on the basis of the "common sense, the common experience and general understanding of the masses of thinking people." There can be no doubt that victory is the goal of all patriots and all the United Nations in this war. But that goal is not the simple, self-evident proposition that it seems to be at first glance. What appears to be universal agreement on its desirability dissolves into sharp difference as to the prerequisites of its achievement in the actual prosecution of the war. The answer to all our sacrifices turns out to be the biggest question of all: what really constitutes the road to victory, a question which soon reappears in the shorter form: what, after all, constitutes victory?

True, the pacts and agreements made by the United States, England and the Soviet Union in June, 1942, completed the foundation of the policy required for victory of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Nations and confirm the character of the war as a People's War of national liberation. But unfortunately for the prospects of victory and a short war, even after the master strategy of the United Nations was clearly laid down in these pacts, "there is still," as Browder remarks, "no general move to revise in harmony with this master plan the thousand minor policies, our daily habits of work, our thoughts and prejudices, all of which are the substance of our national life and effort." (p. 45.)

Worse than that, failure to translate this master strategy into the terms of coordinated military action, as reflected in the delay in opening a Second Front in Europe, jeopardizes the cause of the entire United Nations, first of all Britain and the United States, and threatens to produce consequences more disastrous and more far-reaching than those of the unforgivable Munich catastrophe. Thanks to the Red Army, the Nazi war machine has once more been brought face to face with a major military crisis and the possibility of irrevocable defeat. A Second Front opened up now by the Allies from the West, while the bulk of Hitler's forces are engaged by the Soviet Union in the East, would assure the utter defeat of Hitler's Axis and bring the war to an early and victorious close for the United Nations. But instead of Hitler's second military crisis being the United Nations' opportunity, our delay in opening the Second Front gives Hitler the opportunity and us the crisis—a crisis not from lack of striking power or favorable circumstances, but from lack of a coordinated, global strategy, from failure to agree on the road to victory and consequently on what, by default, would constitute our defeat. There can be no doubt that all this vacillation and hesitation on the main prerequisite of military victory only facilitates the work of the defeatists everywhere in spreading the germ of doubt as to whether there is any room for the Soviet Union in our conception of victory, the Soviet Union whose glorious army has almost single-handedly forged the prerequisites of victory, not once but twice now in the past sixteen months. As Browder declared in a recent speech, the whole question "is summed up in one issue, whether our country can meet the crisis of war with honor, whether we win through to freedom or go down into slavery, whether we have the quality of victors or whether we shall be shamefully defeated without even having fought—all this is summed up in the one issue of the immediate opening of the Second Front in Europe." (*The Worker*, Oct. 4, 1942.)

There is thus no ordinary urgency about the question of victory in this war. Victory is so vital because its alternative is death. This global war, which broke through the bounds of imperialism with a sudden swing away from the purely imperialist direction it was taking at first, will decide the fate of nations for generations to come. This fact fixes the nature of the present war as a war of survival, a People's War for National Libera-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. And the nature of the war dictates the pressing importance of the whole question of victory. How little we can assume that the acceptance of victory is a matter of course may be seen from the fact that the advanced section of the working class is against victory in unjust wars while, in the present just war, the most reactionary circles of monopoly capital do not regard victory as the desirable outcome of the war. The question of victory, therefore, is not just a question of the technical conclusion to military operations. It is the central political question affecting all others and is in turn affected by them.

The chief problem is how to assure that all groups, classes and nations which are united in this global war of national survival recognize the conditions of victory which such a war must meet and translate that recognition into corresponding policies of action. This problem arises from the fact that while the war is a People's War of National Liberation, "it is not," as Browder correctly says, "*purely* of this character. Like all modern wars it sprang from the widest mixture of causes, motives, policies. It has this character *predominantly, decisively,* for human progress, while victory for the Axis destroys thees preconditions." (p. 30.)

It is at this point that Browder makes a major contribution to our whole understanding of the war. The nature of the war is not something that can be understood as separate and apart from the conditions of victory. There is a vital interaction between the two. It is true that the character of the war, in the last analysis, is dictated by the fact that victory for the Axis would destroy the precondition for human progress, and that even the imperialist powers within the United Nations have been presented with the alternative of destruction or victory in a war which has broken through the bounds of imperialism. But it is equally true that victory for our side can only be achieved through alliance with the Soviet Union, the liberation of nations and the abolition of the colonial system. The undemocratic and imperialistic aspects of the policies and practices of the United Nations and Great Britain are no longer decisive as to the character of the war, but "their modification and elimination will be decisive for victory in the war." In other words, the character of the war, dictated by the fact that it is a war of national survival, at the same time dictates prerequisites for victory which in turn act to make the war a People's War of National Liberation. It is on this dialectic basis that Browder defines the nature of the war as arising "out of the character of the forces in combat, the policies which they are following, the results which each is struggling to achieve through the war, and the logic of the struggle inevitably arising from this relation of forces." (p. 29.)

It is obvious from this that the concept of the "People's War" is not just a formal, descriptive label. It has a definite historical content and significance, a definite bearing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the prerequisites of victory, on which, after all, our national survival depends. It is not merely a description of the fact that the people are interested in the war and its outcome; it is the description of a profound historical distinction, a distinction from other kinds of war, unjust wars, wars for empire; a distinction not only in the aims, but in the methods and forces involved. There is unquestionably an impressive truth in this whole approach to the war—the truth that you cannot wage a People's War as if it were a war for empire and expect to win; you cannot leave out the people, the people of all the United Nations, without losing the war. In short, you cannot retain national independence by fighting for imperialist domination. That is the far-reaching lesson of this war of national survival.

The implications of this analysis are of enormous significance. Victory becomes the prime consideration and the fulfillment of its prerequisites the supreme law. The whole question of the *time* of victory is at stake in this approach, and in the question of time is not only involved the lives of millions but the very possibility of defeat.

But the first thing about victory is that it has to be fough for, and you cannot fight for victory without a correct policy. Superior armaments are a poor substitute for inferior policy, as the history of the whole past decade has amply testified. Our failure to understand this simple lesson in the past, despite the frantic efforts of history to teach it to us, has already exacted a terrible price from our generation and threatens to exact an even greater price for generations to come unless we quickly overcome our reluctance to learn this elementary rule of life.

There is only one road to victory, and that is courageous and decisive action based on a vigorous offensive policy incorporated in a global strategy and inspired by a single determination—to win through at all costs. If victory is our goal, then we must relentlessly sweep aside all obstacles, all rivalries, all contradictions and considerations of a secondary nature, including the poison of Hitler's secret weapon, which attempts to paralyze the country with doubts and hesitations over an alleged "menace of Communism." There can be no correct policy unless we do away with all those practices that deprive us of allies at home and abroad, and that means forging unbreakable anti-fascist national unity and complete confidence and cooperation among the United Nations. It means directing an uncompromising fire against the Fifth Column and defeatists everywhere, nullifying all their efforts to divert us from the path of victory. The penalty of failure is death by national enslavement, a penalty which will be exacted not only if we fail to wage the war as a People's War of National Liberation, but also if, in the course of this, we speculate on receiving victory as a gift from others, meanwhile failing to fight at all.

It might, of course, be argued that Browder is unduly optimistic about the ability of Great Britain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the United States to fulfill the requirements he has outlined for victory, since, in the last analysis, they are both imperialist countries, and that to expect them to do it is to expect the impossible. To which Browder replies: first, that in war the impossible not only becomes the necessary but also the possible, so that the miracles that capitalism prevented in peace, it finds the energies and resources to perform in war. Secondly, it is neither the hearts nor heads of statesmen in England and America, neither moral nor ideological motives that will impel them to adopt correct policies, but the iron and brutal necessities of national survival, the sheer military necessities of victory. The logic of the struggle will drive the United Nations to modify and break down the obstacles to universal national liberation, just as the logic of the drive for world conquest drives the Axis to more extreme enslavement of nations and peoples.

This brilliant observation is developed into one of the central thoughts of Browder's book.

Actually the "iron laws of military necessity" have so far taken the form of military disasters, with the exception of the Russian glory which has till now saved the United Nations from complete defeat. In this connection Browder remarks: "It will be sad, indeed, if we are to require a new disaster to push us into each new step—that would be a long and bloody road to victory, unnecessarily long and unnecessarily bloody." And though Browder is confident that necessity will dictate the adoption of new policies and new thinking by our nation, he does not even exclude the possibility of failure. "If we fail to accomplish it completely," he says, "we go down to Nazi slavery."

The limits indicated here to the validity of the idea of the "iron laws of military necessity" are important. They indicate first of all that the main significance of this idea lies in the fact that it provides us with the only basis on which a policy of victory can be built, in the fact that there is such a basis and that we can ignore it only at the price of forfeiting victory itself. Its significance does not lie in any special powers inherent in it of automatically forging and enforcing the adoption of correct policies.

The idea is, therefore, only a simple statement of fact that, to the extent that correct policy is adopted, it will not be from ideological motives but from the iron necessities of survival. Beyond that it depends upon a whole number of other factors as to whether the necessity for such policies will be translated into actual adoption, chief of which is the influence of labor and the people. And it must be said that labor's capacity for action, thanks to its powerful trade union organization, has multiplied a thousandfold in the past period. If assurance is to be had that these iron necessities will really be *iron* and *overriding* necessities, they must include as one of their chief elements the constant pressure and active participation of the masses, counteracting and nullifying the influence of the defeatists and establishing that relation of forces which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constitutes the indispensable medium through which the iron necessities assert themselves. The necessities of war that led Lincoln to adopt the Emancipation Proclamation included the pressure of the popular masses of the North. If the American people have to learn any single, major lesson in the war, it is that their political intervention, not only in following, but also in shaping policy, is the most decisive element of all in the whole process. That is certainly the lesson being taught us by the catastrophic delay in opening a Second Front in Europe.

To say that national survival cannot be bought at any other price than victory only presents us with a drastic alternative but does not mean that the policies for victory will automatically or even inevitably be adopted by the ruling circles. There is nothing inevitable about it; there is no inexorable law of nature operating here. The objective social laws that are working themselves out in this titanic struggle are long-range laws which only provide us with the possibility of victory, without excluding the probability of defeat. It is inconceivable that the general curve of human progress can be held up indefinitely by the forces of destruction and reaction. But they can exact a horrible price; they can impose the terror and devastation of a thirty-year war, only multiplied a thousandfold by their greater power of destructiveness. They can so weaken the forces of progress as to retard their ultimate triumph for a long, long time. Civilizations have been extinguished before, and men have had to begin the climb from the bottom up all over again. And even though, in the long run, the march of progress will continue as it has in the past, there is nothing in the mere quantitative preponderance of productive forces, in the numerical superiority of factories and men to guarantee victory. The assurance of victory can only come from the ability of the forces of progress to make decisive use of their superiority by overcoming their self-imposed shackles and eliminating the obstacles to timely action. It can only come from the will to victory, from the qualities of human courage and determination to remain free regardless of the cost. That we are capable of it is demonstrated by the magnificent heroism of the Soviet people. They are truly the inspiration of mankind and the assurance, even to us, that come what may, cost what it may, the people everywhere will hold out and conquer.

II. The Problem of National Unity

A policy of victory is impossible without effective anti-fascist national unity at home. The second and largest section of Browder's book is devoted to an examination of this question. There is here no timid avoidance of delicate problems, no superficial and futile effort to ignore the social and class differences of the forces involved or to obscure and gloss over issues as a means of "slipping over" national unity on some deceptive and artificial basis. The heart of the concept of national

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unity is strict adherence to the common necessities of victory inherent in all the divergent forces united for national salvation and the defeat of the Axis. That is possible only where the sources of difference are kept clearly in view and frankly evaluated. In formulating the requirements of such a policy of national unity, Browder applies the criterion of America's national interest integrated with a global viewpoint as the undeviating measure of all policy.

It is no accident that Browder opens the examination of the problems of national unity with a series of startling chapters identifying and exposing the Fifth Column conspiracy. The main obstacle to effective anti-fascist national and international unity has been the paralysis and confusion of mind and policy induced by a misinformation and prejudice in our attitude toward the Soviet Union and communism. Browder's proof that Hitler Germany has deliberately and consciously cultivated the anti-Communist campaign in the United States as its chief means of preparing to defeat and conquer our country is an invaluable contribution to the cause of victory. The story of this intrigue cannot fail to jolt even the most skeptical and prejudiced person.

Establishing the identity and genealogy of America's Fifth Column, Browder provides documentary evidence to show that we are not dealing here with just a general ideological agreement of American and German fascists but with a deliberate conspiracy, representing the direct intervention of the Nazi government, setting as its main objective the imposition of a domestic and foreign policy on our country favorable to the plans of Hitler Germany, and even setting up an agency in the heart of our Government, the Dies Committee, as its chief instrument for the execution of this scheme. The extent to which this conspiracy succeeded in its treason is staggering. For years it was able to divert our country from a correct foreign policy, helping to bring on the war and exposing the United States to the danger of defeat and destruction.

This conspiracy was launched as early as 1933 when the "anti-Communist" war cry was first raised to a shrill pitch by Hitler Germany. Hitler's propaganda agents in the United States immediately set to work to do the same thing in this country. That job was done by Hamilton Fish together with a number of associates acting openly as part of Hitler's "General League of German Anti-Communist Associations," the prototype of the anti-Comintern axis. The American section of this league published Hitler's first big propaganda gun in this country, a book entitled *Communism in Germany*, circulating huge quantities free. The immediate object of this book was to prevent the United States from recognizing the U.S.S.R., that is, to obstruct U.S.-Soviet collaboration and friendship. It was no accident that, eight years later, Fish's secretarial employee was arrested as a Nazi propaganda agent. In Browder's words: "From Hamilton Fish,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to George Hill, to Germany's war against the United States is a clear line of political preparation for the climax of military aggression." (pp. 99-100.)

This political preparation was further advanced four years later with the help of two of Hitler's agents, Baron von Killinger and Baron von Tippleskirch, in an agreement which they reached with seven prominent Americans. This agreement was embodied in a five-point memorandum written on November 23, 1937, providing a platform for the work of the Fifth Column in the United States.. This is a document which every American must know in order to have his eyes opened to the most amazing conspiracy against the United States since the days of the War of Independence and the Civil War. It can be studied in detail in Browder's book.

In this document will be found the platform of all Fifth Columns and Hitler stooges in Europe and America, the Cliveden Set in England, the Lavals, Doriots and Pétains in France, the Rexists in Belgium, the Quislings in Norway, and above all the Dieses and Coughlins in the United States. The central thought of this document is how to prevent the development of friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, while encouraging benign trust in and sympathy toward Hitler Germany, and even taking it as the model for our own existence. It reveals the technique by which the Fifth Column recruits Americans into conspiracies for the conquest of the United States itself, appealing to their class prejudices and their greed, creating a "menace of Communism," whipping up fear and antagonism toward the Soviet Union, and even getting Congress itself to set up a committee to work for them.

The story of Martin Dies is itself, as Browder remarks, "the most amazing of all the fantastic stories that have come out of this war." And it must be said that the recounting of this story is not only one of the most fascinating parts of Browder's book, but also one of its most significant contributions to the cause of national clarity and national unity.

Dies's whole work was a preparation to put the United States into war against the Soviet Union as a preliminary to Hitler's war against the United States. The essence of all his activities has been to establish, encourage and disseminate the idea that the Soviet Union is the most serious and almost sole enemy of the United States. He was quick to brand anyone who challenged his aim of war against the Soviet Union as a traitor to our country.

The question posed by Martin Dies and his associates, a question involving victory or enslavement for our nation, still remains unanswered. That question, according to Browder, is: "How can a nation fight through to victory, in a world-wide struggle of survival, of life and death for nations, when the powers of Congress are handed over to men who treat our enemies like friends, treat our friends like enemies and who thereby throw the public mind into unutterable con-

CC-0. UNZ.ORG DIGITIZED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fusion? How can we defeat a powerful and malignant and devilishly clever enemy, when we continue to allow him to 'sabotage our minds,' when we continue to think as he wants us to think?" (p. 63.)

The working out of this Fifth Column line, however, is not confined to the activities of the Dies Committee. Those interests, groups and individuals, Browder points out, who naturally respond to Hitler's Fifth Column, tend first of all to turn to the Republican Party. The memorandum drawn up by Hitler's two Nazi agents and the seven Americans, for example, suggested that they "center around the Republican National Committee." Likewise, in Congress the reactionary bloc has as its core Republicans allied with Southern Democrats. The Republican Party was the chief vehicle of the "isolationist" trend before December 7 which facilitates pro-German and appeasement trends today in Republican councils. This trend is represented by Hoover, Landon and Taft, who dominate the official and party-machine circles of the Republican Party. Hoover's book on "Lasting Peace" actually is the platform for American imperialists in this war. To win the rank and file of the Republican Party away from Hoover and his friends is one of the important conditions of breaking down all obstacles to national unity.

Other carriers of the "anti-Comintern" line of attack against our country's best interests are the Sociailst Party of Norman Thomas, which has degenerated into an auxiliary of the Fifth Column, the Trotskyites, the Social-Democratic Federation and the Lovestoneites. All these muddy waters, Browder points out, furnish ideal fishing grounds for the sinister forces of the Fifth Column. None of these groups should be underestimated.

Hitler's Fifth Column and its auxiliaries have succeeded so well in building up hatred and fear of the "menace of Communism" in the United States that it unquestionably disturbs American public policy today and interferes with the victorious conduct of the war. Browder, of course, recognizes that not all anti-Communist thought and feeling in this country are of a fifth-column character. There is considerable anti-Communist feeling among genuinely patriotic elements, although the great majority of Americans are simply non-Communist. But fear of the Communists is a fact and the interests of victory require that its distorting effect upon our thought and action in the war be eliminated.

Browder makes an impressive contribution toward this end, not by undertaking to make converts to Communism or arguing the merits of its ultimate program which looks toward a socialist U.S.A., but by demonstrating that the fear that has been built up around the words "Communism" and "Communists" is pure fantasy.

Unfortunately, as Browder points out, there are many people who are ready to give up their lives to defeat Hitler, but are not ready to give up their "anti-Communist" phobia which they accepted from Hitler. These are the people who,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being unable to say anything against the Communists at present, insist on digging up an alleged "disgraceful record" of the Communists in the past, that is, during the life of the Russian-German pact signed in 1939.

Browder's answer to this discredited slander is really an incomparable contribution to the elimination of one of the more insidious brands of obstacle to national unity. If anyone's thinking is still so far behind events as to allow him to continue placing credence in this rotten red herring, let him read Browder's answer to T.R.B. in Chapter VII and with this, Browder's account of the record of the Communist Party's attitude toward President Roosevelt in Chapter X. Let him study the consistency of the Communist Party line in the light of the irrefutable evidence adduced by Browder regarding the Fifth-Column conspiracy and its effect upon American foreign policy, and then let him judge as to whose record is really disgraceful. No honest judgment can fail to acknowledge the fundamental consistency and underlying continuity of the Communist Party's line in the true interests of the nation.

What is it, Browder asks, that distinguished our position from others at that time? It was our insistence that the United States, in its own national interest, should combine with the Soviet Union to banish the forces of destruction from the earth. Ten days after the outbreak of the war, on September 11, 1939, Browder points out, the National Committee of the Communist Party even addressed an Open Letter to the President offering to support him against American involvement and for collaboration with the Soviet Union against the forces of destruction. Unfortunately, Hitler's "anti-Communism" Fifth Column was able to sabotage our government's foreign policy in this period, preventing the pursuit of a clear line and creating an attitude of hostility toward the Soviet Union. But the Communist Party never wavered in its opinion that our national interests required American-Soviet collaboration which had to come sooner or later. The Communist Party never wavered in working for this even when its leaders were imprisoned on miserable pretexts and the party was persecuted in Hitler fashion. As a matter of fact, the Communist Party supported the President from the first days of 1936 when it was convinced that he was pursuing an anti-fascist policy. It broke with the President only in October, 1939, and that break lasted for eighteen months. "When we broke," Browder declares, "it was on a principled disagreement as to which direction lay the true interests of the United States. When this disagreement was wiped out by history, by events, we resumed our consistent and effective support of the President."

Events have taken the ground from under the whole "anti-Communist" campaign. And yet, as Browder observes, "the hatred remains, the prejudices persist, the laws thus inspired remain on the statute books, the habits built up under such inspiration remain fixed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—all poisoning the daily life of American democracy and preparing for our nation new mistakes and new disasters, unless as a nation we are big enough and honest enough to wipe out this shameful page in our history and begin anew." (pp. 111-12.)

The significance of Browder's entire argument so far takes its force especially from the distinctive prerequisites of national unity characteristic of an advanced capitalist country like ours. As Browder points out, national unity in the United States is above all a problem of adjusting class interests without the severe struggles by which this has usually been accomplished.

True, the foundations for national unity in the United States have already been laid, particularly in the President's policies. American labor has contributed by declaring the suspension of any resort to strike action until victory is won. A large and growing section of industrialists, financiers and their public spokesmen have accepted the essential principles of this program. And the Communist Party has made its first contribution by subordinating its most distinctive programmatic demand—the advocacy of socialism for our country—to the common goal of victory, refraining from bringing it forward in any way which could undermine or weaken national unity. But in a situation where promise and performance are still far from identical, where class prejudices and differences are no easy highway to agreement on the common task, the perpetuation of anti-Communism is a sure way of undermining the whole uneasy structure of national unity.

At the same time, starting from the social and class realities prevailing in our capitalist society, and keeping in mind the prerequisites which they exact, Browder rejects any proposals which would make the achievement of national unity dependent upon any fundamental change in the existing class relationships. It is from the viewpoint of the implications of this approach that he discusses frankly the whole conception of "equality of sacrifice" in the war effort. He refuses categorically to create or foster any illusions about this concept or to be carried away by a phrase in the serious business of maintaining the collaboration of classes in the war effort, attractive as that phrase may be to one or the other side. He undoubtedly remembers well Goethe's admonition that "where ideas fail one, a phrase always rushes to the rescue." And just as Browder refused to allow the future of American-Soviet relations to be jeopardized by tolerating the friendly but erroneous notion of an advocate of good relations that the Soviet Union is going back to capitalism; just as he accepted nothing short of the truth on that vtial question, so on questions of national unity, Browder is satisfied with nothing less than the rigorous, painful, inexorable truth.

And the truth is that "the workers must make the main sacrifices and they have enough common sense to know it, and enough patriotism not to object to it. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers and farmers, the men and women who toil, are already making and will continue to make the major sacrifices without which victory in this war will be impossible. They are not haggling, and will not haggle, about the precise measurement of each sacrifice. They are interested only in victory, and they are prepared to pay the necessary price whatever it may be. But they are also determined that the entire nation shall contribute to victory to the fullest possible extent, that no special interests shall be allowed to obstruct, hamper or delay their victory." (p. 86.)

Taking the nature and the accustomed standards of the capitalist class into account, Browder agrees that the President's proposal of allowing the rich a maximum income of $25,000 a year is necessary to secure their loyalty. This is a compromise, to be sure, but it is a compromise necessary to national unity in the United States. Indeed, that any compromise with the upper classes is possible at all is proof, according to Browder, that the urge of patriotism is working in them also, as among the working class and farmers.

One cannot demand measures that go beyond the criterion of military necessity without being moved by some aim which he considers more important than victory in the war.

To the proposition that national unity in the United States can only be based on the maintenance of existing class relations, Browder adds the proposition that, in its political aspects, national unity must be achieved through the dominant two-party system. He rejects as impractical for the war period any general readjustment or regrouping of the party structure in our national political life, and he assumes that the Communist Party in this period will continue its role as a minority party whose chief contribution is to deepen the political thought of the nation.

Insofar as political parties go, Browder regards the Democratic Party as the chief factor in national unity, and the President as the most important single factor in that party, which also contains within itself some of the most damaging Fifth-Column forces, and which, by relying on the "Solid South" of the poll tax and "white superiority," rests upon a rotten foundation. Winning the Democratic Party to democracy Browder regards as the task and duty of the entire nation. Actually, Browder points out, the Democratic Party, like the Republican Party, does not really exist as *one* party, except for the unifying role of the President. "The central problem of the Democratic Party," Browder says, "is thus the question of winning that party, in its entirety, to the policies of Roosevelt and the Atlantic Charter, to give it a local and state leadership which applies those principles to the entire life of the nation." (p. 139.)

As for the struggle *between* both major parties, Browder points out that where the forces of national unity dominate both the task is to do everything "to help soften the sharp edges of antagonisms between those who agree in substance but are divided formally and transform

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them into a cooperative rivalry as to who can most effectively serve the nation and its unity." Where the defeatists dominate one party, the task and duty is to rally all forces around the one party where the viewpoint of national unity prevails.

If the achievement of national unity, as far as its class and political aspects are concerned, depends upon the maintenance of the prevailing relations, this cannot apply to that field of problems which affects the thirteen million Negroes, the millions of women, and the various national groups. The latitude unavoidable in the interpretation of "equality of sacrifice" insofar as class relations are concerned must be replaced by a much more strict interpretation of equality in respect to these other problems. It would be utterly destructive of national unity and would undermine the United Nations to make peace with the status quo which is based on Hitler-like racial conceptions. "We must," Browder declares, "as a war necessity, proceed to the systematic and relentless wiping out of every law, custom and habit of thought which, in flagrant violation of our Constitution, enforces an unequal status between Negro and white citizens of the United States." (p. 91.) To those who are not so quick to grasp the enormous urgency of this necessity in relation to our national unity, we recommend for special reading that really superb part of Browder's discussion of the Democratic Party which deals with the "Solid South," and which is based on Browder's personal study during fourteen months "residence" in Georgia!

III. The Problem of the United Nations

This is a global war and victory can come only if we fight the war as a United Nations war. This means that we must give up any idea that there is a natural and inevitable conflict between our national interests and the interests of the United Nations. We must give up that conception of national interest which regards it as involving rivalry and antagonism with all other peoples and governments. That, Browder points out, is the America First concept which they combine with the idea of conciliation of the Axis. But the America First habit of thought is a form of national suicide. "We must learn to think in terms of the common interests of peoples and nations before we can act for those common interests." We must learn to do this because the only overriding national interest in this war is destruction of Hitlerism and victory for the United Nations.

Unity of the anti-fascist nations, like national unity inside our country, must be based on a recognition of differences. These, as Browder describes them, range from differences in social and economic organization, as expressed in advanced capitalism and socialism, differences between dominant nations and their subjects, as, for example, between Great Britain and India, contrasts between great powers and small nations, and the traditional rivalries among the great powers themselves, as between England and the United States.

It is obvious that if unity is to be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

established and maintained in such a situation, it must arise out of the common recognition of common necessity, and that can only mean agreement among equals, and a recognition that victory for the United Nations, which include capitalist and socialist countries, must mean victory without any necessary fundamental changes in the regime of each country.

Agreement among equals requires, first of all, that an end be put to the misunderstanding, suspicion and fear of the Soviet Union which exist in Great Britain and the United States and which have been the greatest single weapon of the Axis, a weapon without which the history of the whole past decade would have been different. There can be no doubt that as long as the United States and the Soviet Union, the two strongest powers, remained apart, the United Nations was impossible. Agreement among equals requires, secondly, that an end be put to the great powers' policy of "talking tough" to their subject peoples, which is the second great difference exploited by Hitler, and instead that the oppressed peoples be won as allies and enlisted on our side. Unless the United Nations wage war against the Hitlerite concept of "racial superiority," they will degenerate into an opportunistic military arrangement which will fall apart under the first heavy blows. Agreement among equals requires, thirdly, that the Anglo-American imperialist rivalries and conflicts inherent in the economic, social and political order which dominates Great Britain and the United States, that is, monopoly capital, be conciliated and softened, eliminating the fear that advantage will be taken by one side over the other as a result of the war, and making it plain that our policy will be determined solely by war needs, affecting all powers alike, and not by any special American grasping for power or scheme to take over the British empire, with John Bull as junior partner. In Great Britain, as in the United States, the obstacles to close collaboration come from the imperialist forces, and conciliation and adjustment depend upon the anti-imperialist forces. In this respect the Soviet Union will have an increasing role in softening Anglo-American antagonisms. Finally, agreement among equals requires that we learn to think and talk with our allies in terms equally valid for all—terms that are neither "pro-socialist" nor "pro-capitalist," neither "Christian" (the majority are non-Christian) or "anti-Christian."

Recognition that a United Nations victory has to be victory without any necessary fundamental change in the socio-economic regime of each country means that neither the abolition of capitalism nor the dissolution of the British empire can be a goal in this war, which does not preclude—in fact, presupposes—far-reaching changes dictated by the necessities of victory in the war; but in that case, neither does it mean the restoration of that empire as a goal in the war. The fact is that the war has already destroyed the foundations of the far-flung British empire, and although this does not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

end the age of imperialism, the epoch of monopoly capital, it does end the possibility of any world system of imperialist rule, and specifically the prospects of colonial empire for American imperialism which after all depended upon the existence of the British colonial type of imperialism and the world structure built around it.

At this point in Browder's argument, the question may be asked: Is there not really a fatal contradiction between this estimate of what the war is doing to world imperialism and the contention that the foundations of capitalism will remain untouched? Is this not in the last analysis basing national and international unity on an idle dream instead of on a recognition of stern realities? It is, of course, childish to imagine that a crisis of such global magnitude as this most terrible of all wars, would or could leave everything the same. Great colonial empires cannot disappear without tremendous effects upon monopoly capital, which after all is essentially a world system. And only an obstinate fool could fail to understand that there are no fixed realities or to see that the realities we are dealing with are in the process of great change under the hammer blows of the war, that mightiest of all forces for change. The fact is that the war is the sternest reality of all, and this dictates the adoption of all measures required for victory, no matter how hard they hit the system as it existed before the war. As Browder says, wherever these policies of victory lead us, the one thing we need to know is that they lead us away from a world of Axis enslavement and the death of civilization. That this, irrespective of all the important modifications of the capitalist system, will not mean the end of capitalism is itself one of the necessities of victory in the war. One thing is certain, that the death of the colonial system does not mean the death of the *nations* involved in it nor of the *nation* that dominated it. What it does mean, under conditions of a United Nations' victory, is the unquestioned extension of democracy in the post-war world and the possibility of still greater social, material and cultural advances along the road of human progress. On this all patriotic groups are agreed. Only those who are afraid of *any changes* are ready to trade the independence of the country for slavery under Hitler.

All this means that international unity, like national unity, must be fought for, if it is to be more than an empty shell. The formal, juridical basis exists in the agreements of the United Nations, but it can only be established as an instrument of victory if it is inspired by mutual confidence leading to well-planned and coordinate action on all questions vital to victory.

Browder's detailed application of this whole approach in a series of chapters on China, India, Africa and Latin America provides some of the finest historical writing of the whole present convulsive epoch. These chapters are masterful, impassioned pleas in the best tradition of Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson and similar great figures of America's democratic line of descent. No

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one, for example, can fail to read Browder's presentation of the Puerto Rican case without recognizing in it the intelligence and conscience of America.

IV. A War Economy

The logical rigor and consistency with which Browder applies the criterion of the overriding necessities of victory are shown in his treatment of the problems of war economy, which he examines in detail toward the end of his book. Victory, Browder declares, requires maximum war production, and this requires "a central administration which will plan, direct, guide and control *the entire economy of the nation*. Until we begin to build such a central administration, the nation will be simply muddling along. . . ." (p. 228.)

For more than a year our country has been going through a transition to war production, without going over to a total war economy, which, in the words of the Tolan Committee, "requires that our vast economic system be operated along organizational lines of a single industrial plant," under conditions where everyday market relationships virtually disappear.

The establishment of such a centralized national war economy and administration would put an end to the economic chaos and confusion, the accumulation of unsolved production problems, the threat of inflation and economic disruption, the sabotage of the President's anti-inflation program, the real and artificial shortages of raw materials, the intolerable lag of production behind the iron necessities of the war, and the attempts to attack labor's living standards and unions and to restrict labor-management cooperation. It would make it possible to achieve maximum production and to provide the superiority of arms necessary for the execution of a victory policy.

The absence of such a centralized economy and administration is alone responsible for the numerous difficulties and our inability to solve them. "It is not a question of good managers or bad managers, of 'dollar-a-year' men against career men or of patriots against profiteers. . . . It is not the result of the 'bickering and quarreling and jealousies and rivalries' among the various government agencies. It is not the incipient inflation already showing itself which is choking our war-production effort." All this is the "result and not the cause of the breakdown of our makeshifts of war economy."

The establishment of such a centralized war economy, with its consequent market relationships, will also change the significance of prices, profits and wages. These categories cease to play their former role. Prices must be fixed and all goods rationed. Profits, which no longer function in the usual way as the precondition to production, must be subject to the requirements of the centralized war plan, production, rationing of material and allocation of men. Wages must provide the guarantee of the fullest needs of food, clothing and shelter required for continuous maximum production and reproduc-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, and protected by rationing of consumption.

There are irresponsible people who accuse the Communists of sacrificing the interests of the workers to the capitalists. But the recognition that the workers must and are ready to make the main sacrifices in the war only means that a new concept of wages is also necessary to make it possible for labor to assure maximum production. That is another reason, from the opposite direction, why the slogan "equality of sacrifice" is inaccurate and unable to describe the actual relation of labor and capital to the war effort. The slogan "equality of sacrifice" is no guide here, because it assumes "that wages are some sort of surplus, which is taken out of economy just as profits are taken out of the economy, and that if the capitalists sacrifice their profits, the workers must sacrifice their wages." (pp. 237-38.) But "if the working class is going to give maximum production for the war," Browder points out, "this means that every possible worker and every possible machine must be employed. If every available man and woman is employed for the war production, it is clear that wages must be translated into the terms of the food and clothing and shelter that can be made available under an ordered war economy for these people who are doing the work to secure their fullest possible efficiency, and counting as an inescapable part of this the maintenance of families." (p. 239.)

Generally, the disappearance of the pre-war market relationships requires the development of new methods of regulating the conditions of labor. "The democratic method," Browder declares, "is one of drawing labor into the government and all war agencies; it is one of taking labor into joint responsibility for production, the settlement of disputed questions through conciliation and arbitration, the maintenance and extension of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively, and the voluntary suspension by labor of the exercise of its right to strike." (p. 240.)

Undoubtedly there are also people who will argue that all this is an attempt by Browder to "slip over" a program of socialism disguised as a war economy. To which Browder replies: "These changes which my argument poses as a need of our war economy are not socialist, and do not result in a socialist system of economy. The war economy under central administration, with labor's active participation . . . would be a capitalist economy, in fact the highest development of capitalism. To those who protest that it is state capitalism, the answer is that state capitalism is but a synonym for capitalism adjusted to the requirements of all-out war." (p. 243.)*

V. The Post-War World

If in the discussion of Victory—And After, Browder places his entire emphasis on the problems of victory, and devotes only five and one-half pages at the end of his

* The substance of this section in Browder's book appeared in *The Communist* for October.—*Editor.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

book to the problems of "After," it is obviously not from exhaustion. It is a considered measure of his estimate of what can and needs to be said of any importance on this question. This little chapter maintains the same high level of thinking and writing characteristic of Browder's entire book, and, by projecting the prospects of socialism in connection with victory in the war, even deepens the whole approach to the main problems of the war.

Unlike those who are busy planning for the future peace, but refuse to plan for the present war, Browder has no blueprints for the post-war world. The only things he regards as reasonably certain are: 1. "With the Axis crushed, there will be a flowering of the genius of the human mind such as has always followed the removal of great repressive forces." 2. "There will be freedom for national development of the hitherto oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and of the submerged nations of Europe." 3. "Many nations which have long been socialistic in their dominant trend of political thought will finally be free to translate their thought into action." 4. "The United States . . . will almost certainly enter the post-war world as the strongest capitalist country and the political center of gravity of the capitalist sector of the world."

Generally, Browder declares "the kind of peace that will follow the war depends upon the kind of war we make."

The central problem of the post-war world will be whether the collaboration set up during the war can be continued and extended to meet the problems of peace. The achievement of this will be an unprecedented step forward in world development. In this respect Browder again reiterates that the policy of the Communist Party is to "aid in every way possible in collaboration with all like-minded persons and groups to secure the fullest integration of the United Nations for the war and equally for the post-war period after victory has been won." (p. 252.)

The central domestic problem of the post-war period will be that of transition from a war economy to a peace economy. The question will be: "Will the United States and the rest of the capitalist world relapse into the chronic economic crisis we experienced since 1929? Will we admit that we can achieve maximum production for war but that it is impossible to produce for peace on a similar scale?" (p. 253.) Browder answers that when the time comes to decide such problems the American people will reject the defeatist answer of those who say we must go back to the old conditions of idleness and stagnation. True, precedent shows us no way to meet this without fundamental changes in our economy. But, Browder replies, "Unprecedented accomplishments in the war will teach us to do the unprecedented things that will be necessary in peace."

No one can complete the reading or reviewing of Browder's book without recalling the conclusion of his first chapter: "Truly, the peoples of the world are on the march. Victory over the Nazi-Axis

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monstrosity of human enslavement lies clearly ahead. The way may be hard but the people are ready and anxious to do their part. Leadership and organization in carrying the master plan for victory [that is, full collaboration of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union to win the war and organize the peace, and above all the agreement for a Second Front in 1942] into every phase of the war, into every nook and corner of an all-out mobilization of every resource, are the problems to which now all thinking shall be turned. We know where we are going. Now we shall proceed more quickly upon our way." (p. 37.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

LETTER OF PREMIER STALIN TO ASSOCIATED PRESS REPRESENTATIVE HENRY C. CASSIDY, OCTOBER 3, 1942

DEAR MR. CASSIDY:

Owing to the pressure of work and my consequent inability to grant you an interview, I shall confine myself to a brief written answer to your questions.

1. "What place does the possibility of a Second Front occupy in the Soviet estimates of the current situation?"

Answer: A very important place —one might say a place of first-rate importance.

2. "To what extent is Allied aid to the Soviet Union proving effective and what could be done to amplify and improve this aid?"

Answer: As compared with the aid which the Soviet Union is giving to the Allies by drawing upon itself the main force of the German fascists, the aid of the Allies to the Soviet Union has so far been little effective. In order to amplify and improve this aid only one thing is required — that the Allies fulfill their obligations fully and on time.

3. "What remains of the Soviet capacity for resistance?"

Answer: I think that the Soviet capacity of resisting the German brigands is in strength no less, if not greater, than the capacity of fascist Germany or of any other aggressive power to secure for itself world domination.

With respect,

J. STALIN.

STATEMENT OF UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE SUMNER WELLES ON U.S.-CHINESE RELATIONS, OCTOBER 12, 1942

WITH regard to the specific "charge that it is on the advice of reactionary officials in the State Department that Chiang Kai-shek is keeping his best armies out of the war," the simple fact is that the nearest approach to "advice" given by any officials in the Department of State in this context has been an expression of an opinion that civil strife in China, at all times unfortunate, would be especially

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unfortunate at a time when China is engaged in a desperate struggle of self-defense against an armed invader. The implication of this expression of opinion was that the Chinese Government should try to maintain peace by processes of conciliation between and among all groups and factions in China. And, the course which Chiang Kai-shek has been pursuing is *not* "keeping his best armies out of the war." Both the armies of the National Government and the "Communist" armies are fighting the Japanese. No Chinese armies are actively engaged in large-scale offensive operations against the Japanese—for the reason, principally, that there is lacking to all Chinese armies types and amounts of equipment which are essential to such operations; but this situation is one which both the Chinese Government and the American Government are endeavoring to remedy as equipment becomes available.

With regard to the specific charge that "the State Department in Washington has informed Chungking's representatives that our Government would be *displeased* if complete unity was established in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists," what this statement alleges is the exact opposite of the fact. The State Department in Washington has at all times taken the position, both in diplomatic contexts and publicly, that the United States favors "complete unity" among the Chinese people and all groups or organizations thereof.

With regard to the specific charge that "these officials continue the old policy of 'war against the Communists in China,' "this Government has had no such policy, either "old" or new. This Government has in fact viewed with skepticism many alarmist accounts of the "serious menace" of "Communism" in China. We have, for instance, as is publicly and well known, declined to be moved by Japanese contentions that presence and maintenance of Japanese armed forces in China were and would be desirable for the purpose of "combatting Communism."

With regard to the specific charge that officials of this Government "tell Chungking it must continue to fight the Communists if it wishes United States friendship," the simple fact is that no officials of this Government ever have told Chungking either that it must fight or that it must continue to fight the "Communists"; this Government holds no such brief; this Government desires Chinese unity and deprecates civil strife in China; this Government treats the Government of China as an equal; it does not dictate to the Government of China; it does not make United States friendship contingent; it regards unity within China, unity within the United States, unity within each of the countries of the United Nations group, and unity among the United Nations as utterly desirable toward effectively carrying on war against the Axis powers and toward creation and maintenance of conditions of just peace when the United Nations shall have gained the victory which is to be theirs.

Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, made the following statement to the press on October 15, 1942:

In *The Worker* of October 4, I made charges that persons whom I designated as "reactionary officials

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the State Department" were encouraging the maintenance of a situation in China harmful to the war effort of our country and its Allies. I spoke of strained relations between Kuomintang and Communists, resulting in the immobilization of large numbers of the best troops of that country. Upon the invitation of Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, I visited him in his office on October 12, in company with Mr. Robert Minor, and heard from him, and from Mr. Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant to the President, a detailed refutation of my charges in this respect. The information received from Mr. Welles and Mr. Currie convinced me that my charges had been made on the basis of incomplete information. I believe it is established that no responsible official of the State Department is contributing to disunity in China, and that the policy of the United States Government is being exerted in the opposite direction. I am therefore more than happy to retract these charges without reservation. What I had thought of as a heavy door that needed pushing open proved to be but a curtain of lack of information. Since many persons in the United States and in China also are without that information which I lacked before visiting Mr. Welles, I believe our war effort will be benefited if I make public that portion of Mr. Welles' remarks which was given to me in written form.

MESSAGE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A. TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA

AT THIS hour when the epic heroism of the defenders of Stalingrad is by its grandeur teaching the whole world how to be free—teaching all lovers of freedom that it is necessary to fight, and how to fight against Nazism-fascism—it is an honor to receive fraternal greetings from our brother Party of India.

You are striving to unite all popular and national forces for their national rights and in defense of India against the Japanese militarists and Axis barbarism. It is the good fortune of the people of China and of India that history has irrevocably placed their opportunity for national liberation into a common channel with the great world-wide struggle of all peoples, joined in the United Nations in common struggle against Hitlerism and the Mikado for national freedom of all peoples.

Despite the inevitable provocations, stupidities and brutalities of British reactionaries that endanger the fate of all mankind in their effort to preserve that which can-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be preserved, the people of India and their leaders, supported by the British, American and other peoples, are striving to defend India from the fate of occupied China and Europe, and to attain national sovereignty in fighting alliance with the United Nations.

History has placed enormous responsibility upon the Communist Party of India, which by its sound principles will be able to exercise an enormous influence upon the course of world events—upon the course of the peoples of Asia and their great share in the inevitable victory of the peoples against slavery.

We Americans are deeply conscious of our special obligation to aid in your struggle, believing that it is possible for our country to exercise a positive influence in full accord with your suggestions. Just as India, China, the Philippines, and all peoples struggling for national liberation—including now all peoples of occupied Europe—have not the slightest reason to doubt that the cause of their freedom is inseparable from that of the heroes of Stalingrad and of China—so also we Americans have the obligation to do all in our power, through the great influence of our country, to help remove all obstacles to India's taking of its place in full membership in the United Nations for the full use of its resources and manpower together with ours for the breaking of the chains of Hitler's Axis which aims to enslave the world.

Every act that strengthens the unity and will of the Indian people to defend India against Axis advance is added weight to the world-wide demand that the Second Front be established in Western Europe now to defend British, American and all peoples, to break up the concentration of Hitler's Axis against the Soviet Union and to bring speedy victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW "INTERNATIONAL" PUBLICATIONS

ECONOMICS OF BARBARISM

By J. Kuczynski and M. Witt

A new study of Hitler's economic "New Order" as it operates in occupied Europe and an analysis of the plans and objectives of the Nazi-fascist German monopolists for world economic domination.

Paper $.15. Cloth $.75

MONOPOLY IN THE UNITED STATES

Prepared by Labor Research Association

The power and profits of the largest American monopolies in a new study which shows how they swallow up competitors, how they establish rigid control of prices, rob the public, blackmail the government, influence Congress, etc.

$.10

LENIN ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

By Anna Rochester

Lenin's thinking on the agrarian question both in Russia and in countries of more advanced capitalist development, particularly the United States, in a new, comprehensive and thoroughly documented analysis by the author of Why Farmers Are Poor and Rulers of America.

$1.75

THE WAR OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

By Joseph Stalin

The wartime addresses of the Soviet Premier mobilizing the Red Army and the Soviet people to all-out struggle against the fascist invaders. These speeches reveal the true character of the war and indicate the strategy necessary for victory.

Paper $.15. Cloth $.75

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Victory—And After

By EARL BROWDER

Earl Browder's new book, VICTORY—AND AFTER represents the first rounded-out and complete statement of the Communist position on the most vital questions of the war. VICTORY—AND AFTER is addressed to the entire nation, not primarily to confirmed Communists.

Because close to four million Americans—and scores of outstanding working class leaders of Europe, Asia and Latin America—petitioned for the author's freedom; because he is the leader of a Party which is playing an increasingly decisive role for national unity and victory, this book by the foremost spokesman of the Communist Party will receive public attention far beyond the circles of his own minority party, and will be read by most open-minded thinkers of all shades of political opinion in the United States.

Victory—And After is a basic Marxist work, applying in a living manner the Leninist theory and method to the solution of the most pressing problems arising from the war, and in its analysis of the conditions required for victory and what to do with victory when we have won it. The nature and character of the war; the strategy required for victory; problems of national unity and the attitude to the war effort of the Communist, Socialist, Republican and Democratic parties; the problem of the colonial and smaller countries such as China, India, Africa, Latin America; industrial production and the role of labor in a war economy; the question of relations between the capitalist countries and the socialist Soviet Union for the war effort and the post-war reconstruction, all these are dealt with authoritatively in this new work.

Special Popular Edition, 50c.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway),

New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED